

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-67 -- 85th Congress

H. R. 6287

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 85-67.....	1
Index and Summary of History on H. R. 6287.....	2

Index and Summary of History on H. R. 6287

March 3, 1957	H. R. 6287 was reported without amendment by the House Committee on Appropriations. Print of bill and House Report 217.
March 26, 1957	House began debate.
March 27, 1957	House continued debate.
March 28, 1957	House continued debate.
March 29, 1957	House continued debate.
April 1, 1957	House continued debate.
April 2, 1957	House continued debate.
April 3, 1957	House continued debate.
April 4, 1957	House passed with amendments.
April 8, 1957	H. R. 6287 was referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of bill.
June 7, 1957	Senate Committee ordered reported with amendments. Senate Committee reported with amendments. Print of bill and Senate Report 416.
June 12, 1957	Senate passed as reported. Senate appointed conferees. Print of bill as passed Senate.
June 18, 1957	House appointed conferees.
June 25, 1957	House received conference report (House Report 636).
June 26, 1957	House agreed to conference report.
June 27, 1957	Senate agreed to conference report.
June 29, 1957	Approved. Public Law 85-67.

Hearings: House Appropriations Committee.
Senate Appropriations Committee.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-67

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1958.

Includes funds for the Bureau of Labor Standards,
Bureau of Employees' Compensation, unemployment
compensation for Federal employees, Mexican farm
labor program, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Food
and Drug Administration, Office of Education,
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and Social
Security Administration.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 22, 1957
For actions of March 21, 1957
85th-1st, No. 49

CONTENTS

ACP.....1	Fish.....26	Price supports.....40
Adjournment.....15	Flood insurance.....54	Property.....17,47
Anti-dumping.....55	Food donation.....50	Reclamation.....11
Appropriations.....6	Forestry.....19,42,48	Reports.....10
Atomic energy.....57	Holidays.....51	Research.....17,26
Banking.....31	Imports.....48	Rice.....26
Budget.....2,33,37,52	Information.....43	Scientists.....26
Corn.....8,36	Insect control.....4,18	Seeds.....20
Cotton.....27,35	Lands.....5,30,45	Small business.....37
Cranberries.....56	Livestock.....53	Soil conservation.....1,23
Credit unions.....31	Marketing.....3,56	Stockpiling.....27,32
Dairy program.....44	Monopolies.....28	Surplus commodities.....29,50
Depressed areas.....49	Organization.....24	Taxation.....53
Electrification.....13,34	Paperwork.....12	Trade, foreign.....9,29
Expenditures.....25	Personnel.....21,24,46	Water resources.....22
Farm prices.....35	Plant pests.....4,18	Wheat.....14,38
Farm program.....41	Poultry.....7,16	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee ordered reported compulsory poultry inspection bill. Sen. Schoeppel inserted Butz' testimony on operation of Public Law 480. House committee reported bill to continue Federal administration of ACP. House committee reported on Administration plan to improve congressional control of budget. House committee reported Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House committee ordered reported marketing facilities loan bill. (Cont'd page 7).

HOUSE

1. SOIL CONSERVATION. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 1045, to continue Federal administration of the ACP (H. Rept. 214). p. 3705
2. BUDGETING. The Appropriations Committee reported on the administration plan to improve congressional control of the budget (H. Rept. 216). p. 3705
At the end of this Digest is a summary of the report.
3. MARKETING FACILITIES. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 4504, to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. p. D228
4. INSECT CONTROL. The Research and Extension Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment to the full committee H.R. 3476, to facilitate the regulation, control, and eradication of plant pests. p. D228
5. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H.R. 5538, to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the U.S. for military purposes shall not become effective until approved by Act of Congress (H. Rept 215). p. 3705

6. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 6287, the Departments of Labor and HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (H. Rept. 217). p. 3705
7. POULTRY INSPECTION. Rep. Dixon expressed satisfaction with the general agreement of witnesses before the Agriculture Committee that compulsory poultry inspection should be administered by this Department, expressed hope for early enactment of this legislation. pp. 3703-04
8. CORN. Rep. Coad requested support of petition to the Secretary to support corn in the commercial corn area at \$1.60 per bushel. p. 3675
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Lane criticized the lowering of tariff rates on products entering this country in competition with our products. p. 3675
Rep. Bailey criticized the proposed reductions in certain tariff rates to "compensate the United Kingdom and Belgium for the tariff-increase on linen toweling". pp. 3696-97
The Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported H.R. 4136, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank may make loans. p. D228
10. REPORTS. This office has received the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury (H. Doc. 3).
11. RECLAMATION. Agreed to a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 2146, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act so as to retain congressional oversight of the small projects program. p. 3679
12. PAPERWORK MANAGEMENT. Rep. Hays commended Secretary of Defense Wilson's announced elimination of unnecessary reports and the reduction in volume of paperwork, and urged further reductions in Government paperwork. p. 3695
13. ELECTRIFICATION. The Government Operations Committee submitted a report pertaining to private electric utilities organized efforts to influence the Secretary of the Interior (H. Rept. 213). p. 3705
14. WHEAT. Received a Mich. Legislature resolution protesting the proposed revision of official standards for wheat promulgated under the U. S. Grain Standards Act. p. 3706
15. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 25. p. 3705

SENATE

16. POULTRY INSPECTION. Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported a clean bill (in lieu of S. 313, 645, and 1128) to provide compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products. p. D226
17. PROPERTY; RESEARCH. Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported without amendment, S. 1034, to convey certain research property to the Univ. of Mo. p. D226
18. INSECT CONTROL. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported without amendment S. 1442, to aid in the control of plant pests. p. D226
19. FORESTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 44, to authorize this Department to exchange certain lands in the Apache National Forest, N. Mex. p. D226

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

MARCH 21, 1957.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6287]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board including the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, and the United States Soldiers' Home.

The budget estimates forming the primary bases of consideration by the Committee will be found in the budget for 1958 on the following pages:

	<i>Pages</i>
Department of Labor.....	825 to 849, inclusive
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	628 to 702, “
National Labor Relations Board.....	153 to 154, “
National Mediation Board.....	154 to 156, “
Railroad Retirement Board.....	160 to 161, “
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	132 to 133, “
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	146
United States Soldiers' Home.....	605 to 607, “

The detailed tabulation at the end of this report reflects each amount included in the bill for 1958, the corresponding budget estimate, and amount available for the fiscal year 1957, with appropriate comparisons. The appropriations for 1957 shown in this tabulation and

elsewhere in this report, reflect only actual appropriations made to date with the single exception of the item of \$275,000,000 for "Grants to States for public assistance" included in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Bill, 1957. This is included in these comparisons since the House of Representatives and the Senate have passed the bill with the same amount for this item. There are now pending before the Committee, additional supplemental requests for 1957 which, to the extent they are granted, will result in increasing the amount by which the recommended appropriations for 1958 are below the appropriations for 1957.

Most of the "salary and expense" items in the bill show increases in 1958 over 1957. This is in several instances, due mainly to increased workload placed on these departments and agencies by the substantial expansion of many of their programs by the last Congress, such as the amendments to the Social Security Act, increase in the minimum wage, the new Water Pollution Control Act, etc. In most instances, however, these increases are made up largely of mandatory increases in costs. The most significant of these is the new and mandatory item of contribution to the civil service retirement fund which will be an expense in 1958 but not in 1957. This one new expense amounts to approximately \$10,000,000 for salaries provided for in this bill.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

The following table compares, on a summary basis, the appropriations for 1957, the requests for 1958, and the amounts carried in the bill:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1957	Budget estimates, 1958	Bill for 1958	Bill for 1958 compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1957	Budget estimates, 1958
Department of Labor.....	\$380,785,500	\$384,678,000	\$364,366,300	—\$16,419,200	—\$20,311,700
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	2,487,062,781	2,582,114,581	2,483,836,581	—3,226,200	—98,278,000
National Labor Relations Board.....	8,951,500	9,575,000	9,450,000	+48,500	—125,000
National Mediation Board.....	1,212,000	1,295,000	1,295,000	+83,000	-----
Railroad Retirement Board.....	[7,030,000]	[8,150,000]	[8,150,000]	[+1,150,000]	[-----]
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	3,305,000	3,610,000	3,550,000	+245,000	—60,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	-----	-----
U. S. Soldiers Home.....	[6,564,000]	[4,750,000]	[4,750,000]	[—1,814,000]	[-----]
Total.....	2,881,321,781	2,981,277,581	2,862,502,881	—18,818,900	—118,774,700

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT OF THE OLDER WORKER

The Committee was happy to note that some progress has been made in the Department's program to better the employment opportunities for the older workers but progress has been much slower than was anticipated. The Committee hopes that the so-called action programs planned for next year will speed up progress in this field.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$1,510,000, a reduction of \$109,000 from the request, and a reduction of \$241,000 below the 1957 appropriation. Some activities that are now financed from this appropriation are to be transferred next fiscal year to the working capital fund, explained below. A straight comparison between the amount appropriated for 1957 and the amount recommended in the bill for 1958 does not, therefore, present a true picture of the Committee's action. When adjustments are made for these transfers, the adjusted appropriation for 1957 is \$1,422,800. In addition to the 1957 adjustments, the Department plans to transfer from this appropriation to other appropriations certain activities in connection with the Older Worker Program and Skills of the Work Force Program, which amount to approximately \$176,000. Taking all of these adjustments into consideration, the amount allowed by the Committee is sufficient to support all of the activities of this office at the current level and will provide increases as follows: (a) \$50,000 for a non-recurring rent item; (b) an increase of approximately \$30,000 for international labor affairs; and (c) an increase of approximately \$80,000 for other activities in the Office of the Secretary.

The only large item disallowed was \$225,000 requested for the initiation of a Defense Mobilization Program. For all practical purposes, this is the same request that the Department made two years ago at which time the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare requested appropriations for Defense Mobilization and Civil Defense programs. These requests were denied and the Committee wrote in its report as follows:

The Committee has disapproved all requests from both Departments, for Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization activities. It is the Committee's firm belief that the scattering of the basic program authorities through the Executive Branch and the piecemeal consideration of appropriations for these activities by the Legislative Branch can result only in confusion and waste of public funds. It would appear that the only businesslike way to handle this matter would be for the central agency, charged with the primary responsibility, to prepare and present to the Congress a total, integrated program. The Committee will expect the Civil Defense Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization each to present such a program in time for the appropriate action during this session of Congress.

In the opinion of the Committee, this language is very clear and leaves no room for misinterpretation. The Committee's recommendations regarding the Civil Defense Program have been followed. It was obvious from the hearings that the Department of Labor would very much have preferred that the Committee's recommendations had been followed with regard to the Defense Mobilization Program. One of the Department of Labor officials stated during discussion of this matter, "We are caught, sir, between the policy of the Committee and the policy of the Bureau of the Budget."

Since the Committee's position in this matter has been so clearly and definitely set forth, one might well wonder whether the officials who made the decision to present the request for these funds in the Department of Labor budget really had very much interest in having them appropriated.

Revolving fund.—While the Committee has denied the request for \$150,000 to capitalize a revolving fund to finance certain central services, it has approved the basic request. The bill includes a working capital fund which will accomplish the same end except that certain services such as information services, budget services, etc., have been deleted. It is the opinion of the Committee that such activities should be financed from annual appropriations and thus be subject to annual review by the Congress. The Committee has also written a provision into the bill which will permit advance payment from the divisions and bureaus receiving the services, thus making it unnecessary to have an appropriation to capitalize this fund.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,225,000, a reduction of \$38,000 from the request, and an increase of \$204,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The amount provided will cover mandatory cost increases in 1958 and will provide about \$20,000 for increases in activities necessary because of the expanded programs of the Department of Labor. The Committee has also allowed the request for \$365,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund to enable the Office of the Solicitor to continue activities in connection with the Federal Aid Highway program at the same level as anticipated for the latter part of the current fiscal year.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$1,031,300, a reduction of \$135,700 from the request, and an increase of \$119,800 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase over 1957 will provide sufficient funds for mandatory cost increases, an increase of \$15,000 for the President's Committee on National Employment of the Physically Handicapped, \$20,000 to extend safety services to industries using fissionable materials, and a small amount to provide for some further activities in the program for improvement of conditions of domestic migrant workers.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$542,000, the amount of the budget request, and an increase of \$159,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. Veterans who went into the Armed Services after January 31, 1955, have no major readjustment benefit, except the benefits available to them with regard to reemployment. They do not have such benefits as unemployment compensation and educational benefits that are available to those veterans who went in before January 31, 1955. This situation has resulted in greater demands on the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights for their services and it is expected that these demands will increase still further next year.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$3,600,000, a reduction of \$340,000 from the request, and an increase of \$201,000 over the appropriation for 1957. The Committee has deleted the words “and training” from the proposed new name for the Bureau and has not included in the bill the requested appropriation language authorizing the Department to expand in the field of training. The increase allowed over the 1957 appropriation is sufficient to cover mandatory increases in expenses for 1958, but will not permit any expansion of the staff.

Many Members of Congress have expressed concern that this proposed program was getting into the field of vocational education. The Committee has, therefore, deferred the possible extension of the program until it has more conclusive evidence of whether or not this concern is well founded.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$6,000,000, a reduction of \$358,000 from the request, and an increase of \$442,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. After taking into consideration a small decrease in activities related to veterans and Federal employees unemployment compensation programs, and the elimination of non-reimbursed work for the Office of Defense Mobilization, the amount recommended will cover mandatory cost increases for current employment and a few small program increases as follows: (a) \$22,500 to provide additional staff to develop programs to assist areas with substantial and chronic unemployment; (b) one additional position to assist State agencies which have communities of substantial surplus labor areas; (c) one additional employee for the Veterans Placement Service; (d) one position for the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, and (e) the continuation of that portion of the older worker program which will be transferred from the Secretary's office in 1958.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation, and employment service administration.—The bill includes \$262,000,000, a reduction of \$8,000,000 from the request, and an increase of \$12,000,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase will provide \$7,745,000 estimated to be necessary to cover increases in state salaries and approximately \$3,500,000 to cover estimated increases in workload. It is the desire of the Committee that the additional amount provided be used primarily to expand activities in the field of employment services for older workers, and for special services to areas with a substantial labor surplus.

The Committee in reporting the 1956 appropriation for this item requested that the Department furnish the Committee a statement each year showing each trip made to a point outside the state by any state official concerned with the activity of the Bureau of Employment Security. The Committee has now received three reports pursuant to this request. As a result of the Committee's request, the Department, through the Bureau, has issued regulations establishing a standard of reporting by State employment security officials covering travel to Washington, which is an improvement over the requirements previously in effect. The Committee has been advised that the standards will be specifically called to the attention of each State agency once each year. These revised standards, taking into con-

sideration the content of the reports rendered as a result of the Committee's request, more nearly meet the point which the Committee had in mind. Consequently, it will no longer be necessary for the Department to make the report requested in the Committee's report on the 1956 appropriation bill.

Unemployment compensation for veterans.—The bill includes \$36,800,000, a reduction of \$5,200,000 from the request, and a reduction of \$33,200,000 from the appropriation for 1957. This recommendation is calculated on the basis of statistical information regarding payments during the last few months, which was of course not available to the Department at the time the request contained in the President's budget was arrived at. The basic legislation guarantees payments to all eligible veterans and, if the amount in the bill is not sufficient, additional funds will have to be made available in a supplemental appropriation. Likewise, if a still greater rate of decline prevails in succeeding months, the unneeded portion of the appropriation can be used for no other purpose and will automatically revert to the Treasury.

Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.—The bill includes \$26,500,000, a reduction of \$5,500,000 from the request, and an increase of \$1,500,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. Since there was a carryover of funds from 1956 to 1957 of over \$3,000,000, the total amount available for 1957 was over \$28,000,000, thus the amount contained in the bill is a reduction of about \$1,500,000 from the funds estimated to be expended for this purpose during the current fiscal year. As in the case of unemployment compensation for veterans, the amount contained in the bill is based on the trend of payments during the last few months, which have been slightly lower than during the comparable period of last year.

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm-labor program.—The bill includes \$2,500,000, a reduction of \$183,000 from the request and an increase of \$375,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. Over \$100,000 of the increase provided is for mandatory cost increases. The remainder of the increase is to provide sufficient funds to take care of the steadily increasing demand for these workers and for some increase in determining compliance with contract provisions.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$2,838,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$491,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. Except for mandatory cost increases which will occur in 1957, practically all of the increase is to provide for three additional field offices. The first field office was established four years ago in San Francisco. On the basis of four years' experience, the Bureau can demonstrate quite conclusively that this office has greatly improved services to claimants in the West coast area. With the establishment of these three additional offices approximately 50% of the operations under the Federal Employees Compensation Act will be decentralized into the field.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$7,470,000, a reduction of \$298,000 from the request, and an increase of \$583,000 over the

amount appropriated for 1957. The increase will provide for mandatory cost increases and for the following program increases: (a) \$30,000 for the initiation of a 3-year program to shift the employment, hours, earnings, and labor turnover data to the new standard industrial classification system in order that these statistics may be comparable with statistics which are published elsewhere in the government; (b) \$100,000 for the initiation of a continuing program of consumer expenditure surveys to assist in insuring that the consumer price index is valid; (c) \$50,000 for statistical analysis of some of the problems affecting older workers; and (d) \$120,000 for the analysis of the effects of tariff changes on U. S. employment. The Committee took into consideration the fact that the retail trade wage survey will be completed during the current year and that the Bureau will have a non-recurring printing cost in connection with the occupational outlook handbook. A deduction of \$170,000 was made for these two non-recurring items.

When the proposed project for analysis of the effects of tariff changes on U. S. employment was discussed during the hearings it was brought out that the textile industry would likely be one of the industries studied. The Committee is convinced that this is one of the greatest problems in this area and feels strongly that priority should be given to the textile industry in carrying out this analysis.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$462,000, the amount of the budget request, and \$59,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$10,888,000, the amount of the request, and \$888,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase provides for no additional personnel. The only item provided for other than mandatory cost increases is an increase of \$232,000 for a one grade promotion to those employees who have satisfactorily completed their first year of employment as investigators. This is in accordance with the established policy of the Bureau to hire at one grade lower than paid to regular investigators and increase the salary only after the employee has proven that he can efficiently discharge the duties of this position.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

RETARDED CHILDREN

Two years ago there was not an identifiable program in the Federal Government aimed at meeting the problem of mentally retarded children. At that time this Committee found that so little attention had been paid to the problem that there were only vague estimates even of the number of children involved. There were only guesses as to the causes of the problem and practically nothing was being done, either to find out more about the causes or to alleviate the problem. As a result of the action of this Committee, \$750,000 was specifically earmarked to do some basic research. Of this amount

\$500,000 was appropriated as an increase over the budget request of the National Institute of Neurology and Blindness, and an increase of \$250,000 was appropriated for the National Mental Health Institute to start research in this field.

In its action on the Appropriation Bill for 1957 the Committee specifically earmarked a minimum of \$2,505,000 for further work in the field of mental retardation. This action provided for a continuation of research at the National Institutes of Neurology and Blindness and Mental Health at not less than the level for 1956. It provided \$675,000 for a specific research program in the field of education of the mentally retarded, which program the Committee had directed the Office of Education to formulate. It provided \$80,000 for the Children's Bureau for work with the States and communities in the field of mental retardation, particularly with respect to preschool children. It provided specifically for \$1,000,000 under the appropriation "Grants to States for maternal and child welfare" to be used for activities in this field, and in its report the Committee indicated the desire that approximately an additional \$1,000,000 be spent from this appropriation if it could be efficiently and soundly utilized.

This still must be considered a relatively new program, however, the Committee is gratified, not only at the progress which has been made within the Department of Health Education and Welfare, but also with the considerable increase in public interest which has been generated by these activities. It is obvious that this is an instance where a new Federal activity has resulted in stimulating far greater activity outside the Federal government. This, in the long run, will undoubtedly prove to be the most worthwhile phase of this activity.

The Committee will expect the Department to continue an aggressive program to determine the causes of mental retardation in children, ways to prevent it, and programs for the alleviation of the problem among those children afflicted. The Committee will expect that there be no diminution in efforts in any of the bureaus now working on phases of this problem and will expect that projects be stepped up wherever good leads indicate that additional activities will pay off.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGING

While the Department was able to show some progress in its work on problems of the aging, the progress falls far short of coming up to the expectations of the Committee. It is hoped that the groundwork has now been laid and that real, tangible progress will be made during the next year.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Several items were discussed during the course of the hearings which indicated undue delay in carrying forth some of the programs and activities of the Department, some of which are discussed beginning on page 40 in the hearings. While the number of these instances does lead the Committee to wonder if the Department is not more assiduous in seeking authority for new programs than it is in carrying them out, most of these delays, individually, do not represent matters of great concern to the Committee.

There is one phase of operations, however, that has been so delayed that it has become a serious matter. This is the construction of buildings for various parts of the Department.

The outstanding example, which is costing the Federal government not just thousands of dollars but actually millions of dollars, is the proposed building in Baltimore for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance personnel. It has been testified repeatedly that this building would save a minimum of one million dollars a year in administrative expenses on the basis of the most conservative estimates. Congress first made funds available for planning and purchase of the site on July 31, 1953. This appropriation was \$1,500,000. Since that time an additional amount of \$23,870,000 has been appropriated for construction. Almost four years have now gone by since the original planning funds were appropriated and the appropriation has not yet been obligated and of course the plans are not yet complete. During the hearings the Committee was informed that even if the plans were complete the Administration policy regarding the deferment of new building would prevent them from proceeding. It was explained that this was an attempt to curb the inflationary spiral now in progress. It was not stated whether or not the effect of spending a minimum of a million dollars every year for which there is no economic return is inflationary.

There are many other examples such as the building program of Gallaudet College which was presented to the Committee as a three-year program in connection with both the 1956 and 1957 budgets. It now has grown to a four-year program and the Committee was told by the President of the College it might be a five or six year program. There has been no addition whatsoever to the plans, just a delay in constructing the buildings. Funds were made available in 1947 to construct a building at Howard University, construction of which has still not begun although the funds are still held with the expectation that someday it will be built. A rather ludicrous situation exists, with regard to the Administration policy on construction, in that funds already appropriated for the construction of Indian hospitals in Arizona and New Mexico have been frozen, and yet in connection with another item, "Grants for hospital construction", new appropriations are requested for construction of hospitals in the same States. For many years there has been a great need for a new building for the Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta. There has been no doubt that a new building which would consolidate the scattered activities of the Center would not only increase the efficiency of operation but would actually save the Federal Government money. This Committee has for years encouraged the Department to come to it with a construction plan and request for funds to carry out such a plan. For no good reason which has yet been presented to the Committee, it was decided instead to get approval of this building under the lease-purchase program. This program of course has completely bogged down.

Other examples could be given but these are adequate background for the action of the Committee in including two special provisions in the bill. One of these would rescind all building funds at the end of fiscal year 1959, thus requiring a resubmittal if the building is still needed. The Congress might then determine whether changed conditions, in the years that have elapsed since the funds were first made available, indicate that the building should be eliminated or the plans for it altered. The second provision would require that the Depart-

ment present all building plans for direct appropriation rather than through the more expensive and apparently much slower procedure of lease-purchase. The Committee will expect the Department to promptly present any such plans that are currently being pursued under the lease-purchase procedure if they feel that it is still important to proceed with plans for such buildings.

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind.—The bill includes \$328,000, the amount of the request, and \$98,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase is necessary because of an amendment to the basic legislation during the last session of Congress which extended the benefits of this program to blind students attending regular schools, and because of the increased cost of producing books and teaching materials.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$9,300,000, the amount of the request, and \$2,521,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. This increase is another step toward complying with the recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee that was established two years ago for the specific purpose of reviewing this activity. The Citizens Committee recommended that personnel and facilities be increased 3 to 4-fold within 5 to 10 years. At the rate provided for in the bill it will take a minimum of ten years to somewhat less than treble the personnel and facilities.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$3,000,000, a reduction of \$32,000 from the request and an increase of \$245,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase will provide for mandatory cost increases, three more positions for the training program and a few more positions to bring services in the general hospital to a more nearly adequate level.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$730,000, the amount of the request, and \$115,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The Committee hopes that this is the final step in a three-year program which the Committee initiated two years ago to bring this school to full accreditation.

Construction.—The bill includes \$1,690,000, the amount of the request, and \$857,000 below the amount appropriated for 1957. For the last two years the Committee has been lead to believe that a three-year program would complete construction of buildings which were deemed to be necessary to make this a first class institution from the standpoint of physical facilities. This year the Committee was told that this program cannot possibly be completed in less than four years and perhaps five or six. While this is an irritating situation, the committee feels that the Congress should continue to help this, the only college for the deaf in the United States, to at least have the physical plant necessary for accreditation. Certainly the delays so far have all been in the Executive Branch and not due to lack of interest or support by the Congress.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$3,800,000, a reduction of \$200,000 from the request, and an increase of \$500,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. It is the desire of the Committee that \$50,000 of the increase be applied to the backlog of repairs and maintenance which have been accumulating during the last several years, and that the balance be for salary increases requested, and additional teaching and teaching support personnel. The Committee is convinced of the desirability of maintaining Howard University as a first class school and is happy to recommend a substantial increase in funds as it has for each of the last two years, however, it is a little disturbed at the lack of corresponding increases in income from non-federal sources. In 1958 the request to the Congress was for a \$700,000 increase, \$500,000 of which is recommended in the bill, however, the income from non-federal sources is estimated to go up only \$156,000. In this connection it is also pertinent to point out that the entire cost of construction, which has run into many millions of dollars over the last several years, is borne by Federal funds.

Plans and specifications.—The bill includes \$150,000, the amount of the request. These funds will be used to begin planning a physical education building and a home economics building.

Construction of buildings.—The bill includes \$262,000 the amount of the request, to complete equipping the Dental School building.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education.—The bill includes \$33,442,081, a reduction of \$308,000 from the request, and \$2,000,000 over the appropriation for 1957. The increase is for the practical nurse training program.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts.—The bill includes \$2,501,500, the amount of the request, and the same amount as was appropriated for 1957.

Grants for library services.—The bill includes \$5,000,000, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the request, an increase of \$2,950,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957, and \$2,500,000 less than the authorization.

Payments to school districts.—The bill includes \$127,000,000, the amount of the request, and \$13,950,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The entitlements are calculated in accordance with formulas prescribed in basic legislation. The Office of Education estimates of the funds required have been relatively accurate during the past few years and the Committee saw no reason to doubt that the estimate presented is the most accurate that can be made at this time.

Assistance for school construction.—The bill includes \$41,700,000, a reduction of \$100,000 from the request, and a reduction of \$66,800,000 from the appropriation for 1957. This request is estimated to be sufficient to fulfill the Federal Government's obligations under the two-year extension program provided by legislation passed in the last session of Congress. The reduction of \$100,000 is from the salaries and expenses portion of this appropriation and will in no way effect the

amount of funds available for actual school construction. The reduction will result in \$700,000 being available for technical services rendered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency instead of \$800,000 requested.

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$7,000,000, a reduction of \$500,000 from the request, and an increase of \$1,730,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. In addition to mandatory cost increases in 1958 the amount recommended will provide for an increase of \$1,280,000 for cooperative research contracts with universities and other organizations qualified to conduct research in the field of education; and approximately \$225,000 additional for personal services costs. Last year an increase of 133 positions was allowed for 1957. Less than half of the additional positions provided for 1957 had been filled by the end of the seventh month of the fiscal year. Until it is known how the recruitment program progresses for the rest of the year, no accurate comparison between the two fiscal years on a "position" basis can be made. However, the total man years of employment provided for by the Committee's recommendations will be considerably higher in 1958 than in 1957. The Committee also believes that certain internal adjustments can be made to provide some increase which will likely be necessary in connection with the operation of the cooperative research program.

Two years ago the Committee wrote in its report that the Office of Education was to develop a research program in connection with education of mentally retarded children. This program was presented to the Committee last year in connection with the budget for 1957. It was estimated to cost \$675,000 during the first year. The new program was approved by the Committee and the full amount of the funds requested was appropriated in the 1957 appropriation bill. In view of the fact that the Office of Education had over a year to plan this program, the Committee was a little disappointed that it was 3½ months after the money was made available before the first research contract was negotiated. However, it appears that good progress has been made since that time and that this program is now progressing quite satisfactorily. To carry forward in 1958 the research projects started in 1957 will cost \$1,183,000. Sufficient funds are provided in the bill to cover this entire cost and provide some additional funds with which to start promising new projects. The Committee will expect that the budget presentations next year will set forth the past, current, and proposed financing of this program more clearly than was done in the budget presentation accompanying the request for 1958.

It has been conservatively estimated that, exclusive of the deaf, there are 1½ million school-age children with speech and hearing disorders. The schools have an unusual opportunity to help these children. Many with defects, especially if discovered early in childhood, could be made completely normal; others have conditions which cannot be corrected but could be improved. Children with speech disorders comprise our largest single group of handicapped children. According to leading authorities, 2 to 5 per cent of our school-age population have speech defects sufficiently severe to interfere with their educational, social and emotional adjustment. An additional

number have sufficient hearing impairment to require special educational provisions. They number from one-half to 1 per cent of the school-age population. While something is being done by the Nation's schools to meet the special needs of these children, it is estimated that not more than one out of four speech-handicapped pupils is receiving remedial speech instruction. There are no reliable estimates of the number of neglected hard of hearing children, but it is known that services for these children are even less adequate. In view of the seriousness of this situation the Committee requests the Office of Education to be prepared to present a program, next year, aimed at solving this problem of giving adequate educational opportunities to children with speech and hearing defects. While the most obvious program would seem to be teacher training the Committee will leave to the professional judgement of the officials of the Office of Education, the determination of what will best meet this situation.

President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.—The bill includes \$200,000, a reduction of \$100,000 from the request, and an increase of \$50,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The law establishing this Committee provides that it shall make its final report to the President by December 31, 1957. The Committee has, therefore, included language in the bill which would terminate the financing of the Committee's operations on that date except for necessary costs of liquidation.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Grants to States and other agencies.—The bill includes \$45,100,000, the amount of the request, and an increase \$7,100,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The amount in the bill includes \$40,000,000 for grants for basic vocational rehabilitation services under Section 2 of the Act, \$1,500,000 for extension and improvement projects under Section 3 of the Act, and \$3,600,000 for special projects under Section 4 of the Act. The maximum authorized to be appropriated for Section 2 for 1958 is \$53,000,000. Since not all States will be able to match the maximum allotment which they could receive under the Act, the figure of \$40,000,000 was presented to the Committee as being a more reasonable estimate of what States could actually match. The bill includes a provision, requested by the Department, which will allow allocations to individual States to be made on the basis of \$53,000,000 rather than \$40,000,000, so that those States that do have sufficient matching funds can take advantage of the maximum amount of Federal funds they would be entitled to under the basic legislation.

During the hearings, it was brought out that the \$40,000,000 requested under Section 2 would be sufficient to match \$24,500,000 of State funds, but that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation estimated that States would have available funds in the amount of at least \$25,000,000 and perhaps as much as \$26,800,000. It was also brought out that the Bureau of the Budget made no reduction in the request. It has been the policy for the last several years for overall ceilings to be established for Departments and agencies when the budget is being formulated. The Committee is going to insist on

more realistic estimates in the future or will drop the open end feature which is now provided regarding allotments of Section 2 funds.

The Committee was somewhat critical in its report last year of the fact that the States have not given as much attention as they should to rehabilitation of the more difficult cases such as cerebral palsy, the mentally retarded, etc. While the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has apparently made some efforts to encourage this type of rehabilitation activities, the Committee was disappointed that the statistics do not show any greater advance in rehabilitation of the difficult cases than is shown in total cases. It is realized that these more difficult cases take more time, and so emphasis on this phase of the program would not show up immediately in the statistics, however, it will be expected that more progress be shown when the 1959 budget is presented.

Training and traineeships.—The bill includes \$4,400,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$1,450,000 over the appropriation for 1957. The Committee will expect that a portion of the increase provided will be used to start a program in the much neglected field of training speech and hearing therapists and will expect the Office to present a good program in this field when they appear before the Committee next year.

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$1,330,000, a reduction of \$115,000 from the request and an increase of \$170,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The amount contained in the bill will be sufficient to cover increased mandatory costs in 1958 and will provide approximately \$100,000 for additional field personnel in order to adequately administer the expanding vocational rehabilitation program in the States.

Public Health Service

Assistance to States, general.—The bill includes \$19,592,000, a reduction of \$5,017,000 from the request, and an increase of \$2,001,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increases and decreases by individual parts of this program are as follows: (a) The increase of \$3,000,000, from \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000, in grants for general health activities was not allowed. (b) The request for special language and \$1,500,000 for a new program of special projects in health of the aged and chronic disease has also been disallowed. The language proposed was new legislation. The Committee cannot believe that the Public Health Service was very interested in this item, for it was handled in such a way that it would obviously be contrary to the rules of the House of Representatives to carry it in the bill and, of course, it would be subject to a point of order. The Committee will expect that the Public Health Service encourage the States to carry forth projects of this type under the \$12,000,000 allowed for general health services. (c) The increase of \$1,000,000, from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000, for public health training has been allowed. (d) The Committee has allowed \$950,000 of an increase of \$1,467,000, from \$4,642,000 to \$6,109,000, requested for direct operations. Approximately \$200,000 of the increase is to cover mandatory cost increases and \$750,000 is to provide program increases in the field of health for the aged and chronic disease and accident prevention.

Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska.—The bill includes \$2,165,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$995,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase results from legislation which was passed in the last session of Congress transferring the responsibility for care of the mentally ill in Alaska from the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice to the Territory. Comparative adjustments have been made in the budgets for the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice.

Venereal diseases.—The bill includes \$4,415,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$220,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. During the last year, for the first time in many years, the incidence of venereal disease has increased in the United States. The Committee is hopeful that continuation of the increase granted last year and the allowance of this small additional increase will assist in reversing this trend.

Tuberculosis.—The bill includes \$7,000,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$340,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase will provide for increased mandatory costs in 1958 and for some increase in contractual services and supplies and materials which are necessary for the orderly continuance of the research program on isoniazid as a tuberculosis preventive.

Communicable diseases.—The bill includes \$6,200,000, a reduction of \$60,000 from the request, and an increase of \$450,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. Approximately \$200,000 of the increase is necessary to cover the mandatory contribution to the Civil Service Retirement Fund in 1958. The Committee will expect that a portion of the increase be used for further development of the fluorescent tagged antibody technique for disease diagnosis. It is hard for the Committee to understand why so little interest has been shown in the development of this technique by the U. S. Public Health Service when many experts in the field feel that it is a development which, if perfected, could revolutionize diagnostic procedures.

Sanitary engineering activities.—The bill includes \$12,640,000, a reduction of \$423,000 from the request, and an increase of \$3,640,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. This rather substantial increase is prompted almost entirely by the expanded program of research and technical assistance authorized by Public Laws 159 and 660 of the 84th Congress. The amount carried in the bill will provide \$4,000,000 for air pollution activities; \$6,500,000 for water supply and water pollution control activities, including \$3,000,000 for grants to States and interstate agencies; and \$2,140,000 for radiological health activities, milk and food sanitation work, interstate carrier and general sanitation, and miscellaneous service and administrative work.

Grants for waste treatment works construction.—The bill includes \$50,000,000, the amount of the request, and the same amount as was appropriated for 1957. The hearings on this item indicate that applications will undoubtedly be submitted for considerably more funds than are included in the bill. The amount included in the bill is the maximum authorized by the Water Pollution Control Act.

Grants for hospital construction.—The bill includes \$121,200,000, the amount of the request, and a reduction of \$3,800,000 from the amount appropriated for 1957. The request included \$90,000,000, a reduction of \$12,800,000 from the amount appropriated for 1957, for general hospitals under part C of the Act; and \$30,000,000, an in-

crease of \$9,000,000, for special categories of facilities authorized under Part G of the Act. While the bill does not change the total it does increase to \$99,000,000 the amount for general hospitals under Part C, a decrease of only \$3,800,000 from the amount appropriated for 1957; and it changes the amount of \$30,000,000 requested for facilities under Part G, back to \$21,000,000, the same amount as was appropriated for 1957.

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.—The bill includes \$1,450,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$69,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase provided in the bill is only to cover increased mandatory costs in 1958.

Hospitals and medical care.—The bill includes \$44,399,000, the amount of the request and \$5,388,000 above the amount appropriated for 1957. The Committee has been concerned for some years about reports that the U. S. Public Health Service hospitals are under manned, that their equipment is obsolete, and that they are, in general, not giving hospital care which is up to the standard of other Government hospitals and first class public hospitals outside the Federal Government. During the past year the Department has had some of these hospitals inspected by impartial experts in the field of hospitals and medical care and their findings seem to completely substantiate the complaints which have previously been received by the Committee. The Committee feels that the medical care given at the U. S. Public Health Service hospitals should either be first class or should be discontinued. It is the belief of the Committee that the former alternative should be followed and it has therefore approved in full the amount requested and will expect a full report next year on what has been accomplished with the increase.

Foreign Quarantine Service.—The bill includes \$3,876,000, a reduction of \$150,000 from the request, and an increase of \$561,000 above the amount appropriated for 1957. The request included approximately \$200,000 to cover the cost of night boarding of ships arriving in the United States from foreign ports. It is expected that language which is now before the House and Senate conferees will be included in the Urgent Deficiency Bill, 1957, and will result in a net savings of \$150,000 from the amount budgeted for overtime in 1958. The action of the Committee in reducing the request by \$150,000 is not intended to in any way restrict the services proposed in the budget. The remainder of the increase is made up of mandatory items, annualization of an increase granted in 1957 for examination of visa applicants in foreign countries, and for a program of increased vigilance against yellow fever which has been steadily advancing through Central America and Mexico toward the United States.

Indian health activities.—The bill includes \$40,000,000, a reduction of \$3,990,000 from the request, and an increase of \$1,225,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. On the whole, the Committee is favorably impressed with the progress that has been indicated since the Indian health activities have been taken over by the U. S. Public Health Service. The Committee is convinced that additional progress can be made with the funds allowed. The amount included in the bill will be an increase of 66% over the last appropriation made for these activities before they were transferred to the U. S. Public Health Service less than 2 years ago.

Construction of Indian health facilities.—The bill includes \$3,096,000, a reduction of \$2,704,000 from the request, and a reduction of \$5,-

666,000 from the amount appropriated for 1957. The Public Health Service had \$5,535,000 available for construction of Indian health facilities during the fiscal year 1956. Of this amount, only \$1,893,439 was obligated, with the result that a large part of the funds appropriated for 1956 carried forward into 1957. The Service requested an additional appropriation for 1957 of \$8,762,000. The full amount of the request was granted, making \$12,403,561 available, including the carryover from the previous fiscal year. During the first six months of fiscal year 1957, only \$411,512 of these funds was obligated. In view of the fact that the construction program has been so seriously delayed, and such a large unobligated balance exists, the Committee has not allowed any of the funds requested for hospitals and clinics and for personnel quarters. Sufficient unobligated funds from previous years are already available to make considerable progress in these two fields. The Committee did allow \$2,596,000 for alterations and \$500,000 for other plant facilities, the full amount requested for these two categories.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The total of appropriations to the National Institutes of Health, leaving out of consideration funds appropriated for construction, for the fiscal year 1956 was \$98,458,000. On the advice of some of the most eminent authorities in the field of medical research, the Congress appropriated \$183,007,000 for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 1957. The estimated amount which will be unobligated at the end of this fiscal year is approximately \$10,000,000. Thus the actual expenditures of 1957 funds will amount to approximately \$173,000,000.

The total amount requested for fiscal year 1958 is \$190,183,000. For the 1958 request to be comparable with the 1957 appropriation one must take into consideration that there are certain increases in mandatory costs in 1958 which will amount to \$3,057,400. In addition the Department's budget proposed that the current policy of paying up to 15 percent additional on research projects to cover the indirect costs of the institution performing the research, be revised to increase the allowance to 25 percent. This increase in overhead allowance would, if approved, have increased costs in 1958 by a total of \$6,863,000. Thus, increased costs that would add nothing to the actual research program would total roughly \$10,000,000. So the 1958 budget provided for approximately \$180,000,000 for the same activities for which \$183,000,000 was appropriated in 1957, but the budget represented an increase over the amount which is actually estimated to be spent of approximately \$7,000,000.

The Committee has approved the total budget request for each Institute. The Committee has not approved the proposed increase in overhead allowance and has included a provision in the bill to limit such allowances to 15%. It was less than two years ago that the overhead allowance was raised from 8% to 15%. The Committee does not doubt that most medical schools need some additional financial assistance, however, funds appropriated to the National Institutes of Health are not for the purpose of general assistance to medical schools, and the Committee was not convinced that the research program for which these funds are appropriated would suffer

by maintaining the current policies in regard to overhead allowances, or that the maintenance of this policy would be unfair to the institutions that request these research grants. The action of the Committee in maintaining the current rate for overhead allowances will free \$6,863,000 earmarked in the budget for overhead and will make it available for additional research. Thus the Committee action approximately doubles the amount of funds that will be available in 1958 for increased activities over the level of operations in 1957.

The policies of the Executive Branch with regard to buildings has already been discussed at some length in this report. Since there is ample information in the hearings with regard to the urgent need for a new administration building and a new dental research building the Committee will not burden the report with a recitation of the need, but it does register its doubts that it is even an economical move to defer this construction since the Institutes are now having to rent space because of the overcrowded condition in their own buildings.

General research and services.—The bill includes \$14,026,000, the amount of the request, and \$1,904,000 above the appropriation for 1957. Mandatory increases in cost under this appropriation amount to \$418,200.

Rapid progress in the fight against disease has emphasized the shortage of fundamental knowledge available today. This appropriation supports fundamental studies with special emphasis on biophysics, general physiology, biochemistry, pathology, pharmacology and toxicology. Most of the results of such research are, in themselves, not spectacular but they form the foundation for achievements in the conquest of specific diseases and disorders. But even in this field of research there have been advances that are obvious to the layman as well as the scientist. For instance, among grant-supported studies on problems of human reproduction and infant and fetal deaths, it was found that suitable treatment may lead to survival of three out of four infants suffering from erythroblastosis, a disorder resulting from Rh blood factor incompatibility. There is no doubt that this finding will result in saving the lives of thousands of infants. A new standard of safety in obstetric analgesia was set in another study which showed that a single injection of a morphine relative (N-allylnormorphine), given a newborn infant, counteracted the respiratory depression of morphine given the mother during labor. Research and training in the fundamental health sciences is just as important and must go hand-in-hand with the research and training programs of the categorical institutes if they are to achieve optimum results.

National Cancer Institute.—The bill includes \$46,902,000, the amount of the request, and a reduction of \$1,530,000 from the amount appropriated for 1957. In comparing the budget request with the 1957 appropriation one must take into consideration that a minimum of \$4,288,000 of the 1957 appropriation is estimated to be unobligated at the end of the year and thus revert to the Treasury.

Cancer continues to be one of our most serious public health problems. This year approximately 700,000 Americans will be under medical treatment for cancer, including about 450,000 newly diagnosed cases. During the year we may expect 255,000 deaths from cancer.

This year about 150,000 Americans will be saved from cancer, but an additional 75,000 could probably be saved by earlier and better treatment. The cost of cancer to our people is tremendous. The annual hospital bill alone is estimated at \$300,000,000, not to mention losses on which it is difficult to place a dollar estimate.

Definite progress in research and related activities leading to more effective control of cancer in man was noted during 1956. In studies of the causation of cancer, differences in lung cancer rates between men and women were related to differences in smoking habits. Diagnosis of cancer was further aided by additional studies on the cell examination technique as a case-finding procedure for uterine cancer. In the field of treatment, refinements in surgical and radiological therapeutics are reflected in better cure rates and prolongation of life, and chemotherapy studies yielded the first marked regression of a solid tumor in the human patient treated with drugs.

The future holds definite promise in the areas of cancer chemotherapy, extension of the cell examination case finding technique to gastric, lung, prostatic and urinary cancer; studies on environmental causes of cancer; and accelerated research on virus causation and treatment of cancer. In chemotherapy, clinical evaluation of compounds already screened for antitumor activity, will be continued on a large scale, including studies on the use of chemical compounds as an adjunct to surgery and radiation of solid tumors.

The Committee was disappointed that more progress has not been shown this year in the chemotherapy program and is convinced that industry could assist greatly in the screening of the multitude of chemical substances that may have anticancer properties. Apparently there are only administrative difficulties in the way of a program of contracting with industry to help with this screening. The Committee will expect such a program to be worked out, and is earmarking all of the \$1,616,000, that was budgeted for overhead but which will be freed for research under the terms of the bill, for this program.

Mental health activities.—The bill includes \$35,217,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$20,000 above the appropriation for 1957. With regard to the comparison of this Institute's appropriations one must take into consideration the estimated unobligated balance of approximately \$3,000,000 which will exist at the end of the year.

Mental illness is still one of our most serious problems. More than one million patients are treated annually in our mental hospitals and an additional large number of persons are cared for in outpatient clinics and by private psychiatrists. It is still true that about half of the Nation's hospital beds are occupied by mental patients. The annual costs of mental illness continue to mount and are now well over the billion dollar mark.

The possibility for greater control over mental illness, however, has emerged with the development of the "tranquilizer" drugs. Largely as a result of their administration, there has been a marked decrease in the number of patients resident in public mental hospitals. The advent of these drugs, moreover, has permitted a new attack on mental illness as an organic dysfunction, and if this can be definitely established, science will have gained an unparalleled opportunity to study the causes of mental illness and thereby work toward their elimination. The immediate future will probably see the develop-

ment of other drugs which may provide broader amelioration of mental disturbances. With the increase of trained investigators who can undertake basic neurophysiological and neurochemical studies of the central nervous system, it seems likely that a far greater understanding of the origins of mental illness will also be achieved. Further studies in juvenile and aging behavior should also yield knowledge useful for the effective prevention of those special problems which afflict man at both ends of his age scale. It is obvious that ample opportunities exist for profitable investment in additional research of the \$830,000 that was budgeted for increased allowance for overhead costs.

National Heart Institute.—The bill includes \$33,436,000, the amount of the budget request, and an increase of \$40,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. It is estimated that an unobligated balance of \$2,000,000 will exist at the end of the fiscal year, thus the increase is greater than apparent by a straight comparison.

Heart disease—which includes some 20 heart and blood vessel disorders—is the principal cause of death in the United States, accounting for more than half of all deaths. Heart disease is also a major cause of disability. Approximately 10 million Americans are estimated to have heart disease, which means that about 1 out of every 16 persons is affected to some degree.

Research in heart and blood vessel diseases is resulting in progress in many areas. Recent advances in surgery have included new techniques for better diagnosis and repair of heart defects, the development and use of various types of heart-lung machines, measures for preventing complications of hypothermia or “ice bath” surgery, and the use of synthetic materials for artery grafts. It can be illustrated that these advances have resulted in saving lives by referring to specific individuals who are alive today and wouldn’t be if it were not for the fact that these new techniques have been developed. In arteriosclerosis, studies investigating diet, fat metabolism, hormones, and other factors, have disclosed much new information. For example, it has been learned that the level of blood cholesterol is essentially independent of cholesterol intake in the diet. Another study has found that feeding of a synthetic compound chemically related to cholesterol inhibits the normal production of cholesterol in the body, thus suggesting the possibility of controlling the blood cholesterol level by means of drugs. In hypertension, the development of new blood-pressure-lowering drugs has continued, resulting in improved use of the agents singly or in combination.

It is obvious that past investments in research in this field have paid dividends and there is every reason to expect additional advancement in the future.

Dental health activities.—The bill includes \$6,430,000, the amount of the budget request, and an increase of \$404,000 above the amount appropriated for 1957. In the case of this Institute the unobligated balance at the end of the year is estimated to be \$100,000 or less.

Very few persons escape oral disease entirely. It represents one-sixth of the total cost of medical care. The population of this country is currently spending one and a half billion dollars in dental care. Further, it is estimated that only forty percent of the people are seeing a dentist. The two most common dental problems which face the Nation are dental caries, or tooth decay, and pyorrhea. Other conditions, less common but no less important, are caused by abnormality

of facial structure, congenital defects and oral infections. The successful application of fluoridation to the control of caries has had a profound effect in those communities throughout the country where it has been in operation as an addition to municipal water supplies. Fluoridation, as a means of prevention of dental caries, has been shown to result in as much as 60 percent less dental decay over non-fluoridated communities. Studies are now under way to evaluate methods for the control of caries in rural areas not served by public water systems, by means of home fluoridators.

Other recent research has indicated that a diet of heat-processed cereal has increased caries in experimental animals. A promising line of investigation of the cause of pyorrhea provides a controlled measure of inflammation which permits chemical study of this phenomena associated with pyorrhea. In research on pyorrhea, a problem of an aging population, the surface has only been scratched and there remain also major problems in the control of caries and the need to develop research manpower and facilities.

The Congress more than doubled the budget request for this Institute for 1957. Indications are that the American people can expect their full dollar's worth and more from that appropriation and from a continued high level of support of these activities.

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.—The bill includes \$17,885,000, the amount of the request and an increase of \$2,000,000 above the appropriation for 1957. There is no unobligated balance estimated to remain at the end of fiscal year 1957 for this Institute.

Diabetes, arthritis and other metabolic diseases afflict an estimated 13 to 15 million persons in the United States. These are for the most part long-term chronic diseases, ranging in severity from minor annoying rheumatic pains to complete incapacitation and death. They afflict all age groups from infancy to old age. The therapeutic measures available at the present time are palliative rather than curative; they can in many cases control the symptoms, relieve pain and prevent major degrees of incapacitation. To those who are helped in this way, the progress has been most worthwhile. But in most cases current knowledge cannot stop the underlying disease processes. The best hope of reaching the ultimate goals of prevention and cure lies in fundamental research in metabolism, endocrinology and biochemistry. Greatest emphasis, consequently, must be placed on such studies.

During the past year evaluation of the new oral drugs for diabetes has progressed rapidly; new and improved steroids have been developed and tested for control of rheumatoid arthritis and related disorders and may be available to the public soon; substantial increases in our knowledge of the basic metabolic processes have been achieved; and other advances have been made which certainly give even greater hopes for the future if emphasis on research in this field is maintained.

Allergy and infectious disease activities.—The bill includes \$17,400,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$4,101,000 above the amount appropriated for 1957. For this Institute, also, there is no unobligated balance of 1957 funds estimated to exist at the end of the fiscal year.

Allergic and infectious diseases are our leading cause of morbidity. Allergies affect some 17,000,000 people and include asthma, a greater crippler than polio. Acute respiratory diseases occur five times more often than their next closest contender in the field of human diseases. Against these and other widespread disorders, some notable

advances were made in the past year. The Institute developed a new respiratory disease vaccine which substantially reduced illness in Naval recruits where it was first used on a mass scale. Viruses have been "trained" to destroy human tumors grown in rats which holds forth obvious hope for advances in combating cancer in humans. Important advances were made in purifying vaccines. Studies of Clinical Center patients resulted in the first direct measurement of human antibody production. The Nation's potential for stockpiling blood by means of a new blood donor method was greatly increased. Defenses against antibiotic-resistant microorganisms were strengthened. Fractionation studies to separate out the precise part of a vaccine which confers immunity may not only result in better vaccines but may well lead to the development of new vaccines. In fact, a vaccine for tuberculosis now seems to be more than just a possibility.

The advances made and the leads developed by the research of this Institute are ample justification for the further increase in funds provided in the bill.

Neurology and blindness activities.—The bill includes \$18,887,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$237,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. It is estimated that this institute will have an unobligated balance at the end of fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$900,000.

An estimated 20,000,000 Americans have some sort of neurological or sensory handicap. Among the neurological diseases which afflict large numbers of people are cerebral palsy, mental retardation, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis and epilepsy. Major sensory disorders include deafness and such blinding diseases as glaucoma, cataract and uveitis. Although research on the neurological and sensory diseases is relatively young, progress has been obvious in many areas. Recent findings, for example, include the development of a multiple transfusion technique often effective in preventing a type of cerebral palsy, called kernicterus, in infants; the development of a new technique which is more than 80 percent effective in defining the size and specific location of brain tumors, including those deep within the brain, thereby facilitating surgery; the development of a diagnostic technique which makes possible the early detection of toxoplasmosis infection, a major cause of the blinding disease, uveitis. There are in addition such advances as the discovery of the cause of the disease, retrolental fibroplasia, that has caused blindness in thousands of infants and can now be avoided; the development of a surgical procedure for treatment of cerebral palsy; and many other advances of the past very few years.

Under the research program provided for in the bill, it is expected that more light will be thrown on the causes of these diseases, and that their prevention in many instances can be effected. In addition the Committee will expect the Institute to start a research program in the sadly neglected field of hearing and speech defects. Earlier in this report the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation was told that the Committee would expect a program to be established in the field of training speech and hearing therapists, and the Office of Education has been requested to present a program in the education field. However, there is also a lack of basic knowledge regarding speech and hearing defects. Before we can really meet this problem as we should, we must have much more fundamental knowledge regarding these disorders than we now have. The Committee is, therefore, earmarking

the amount of \$620,000, budgeted for the increase in overhead on research grants, to start such a research program.

Grants for construction of health research facilities.—The bill includes \$30,000,000, the amount of the request, and the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal year 1957. This program was authorized by the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956. This Act provided for a three-year program of grants to non-Federal public and non-profit institutions for the construction of research facilities in sciences related to health. It authorized an annual appropriation of \$30,000,000 for each of three years starting with fiscal year 1957. It is obvious from the applications which have already been received that requests from eligible institutions will far exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated.

National Library of Medicine.—The bill includes \$1,450,000, the amount of the request. This is a new item in the U. S. Public Health Service having been transferred from the Department of Defense, on October 1, 1956, in accordance with Public Law 941 approved by the last session of Congress.

Retired pay of commissioned officers.—Inasmuch as the expenses incurred under this appropriation are mandatory by law and beyond any administrative control, and since the item is relatively small, the Committee has changed this from a definite annual appropriation to an indefinite annual appropriation.

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$5,100,000, a reduction of \$50,000 from the request, and an increase of \$1,208,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. This appropriation covers the expenses of the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General. The bulk of the increase provided for in the bill is necessary to cover increases in mandatory expenses and expenses incident to the survey and special studies to obtain information on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States, authorized by Public Law 652, passed by the last Session of Congress.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$3,000,000, a reduction of \$265,000 from the request, and an increase of \$263,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The amount contained in the bill will be sufficient to cover mandatory cost increases in 1958 but will not provide for any additional personnel. The number of patients cared for at the hospital has decreased slightly during the last year. While the justifications submitted to the Committee contained an estimate that there would be no additional decrease in the next fiscal year, there is some evidence to indicate that this trend will likely continue. The Committee doubts the necessity for an increase in personnel at the same time that the number of patients is going down.

The Committee was also disturbed over the fact that the District of Columbia had not been invited to participate in any of the discussions and hearings before the Bureau of the Budget on the formulation of this request, even though the District of Columbia bears 73% of the cost of operating the hospital. The Committee was told that officials of the District Government were not even advised that an increase was under consideration until after the request had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Committee hopes that hereafter, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia will be given

an opportunity to participate at least in the hearings of the Bureau of the Budget regarding the formulation of budget requests for St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds.—The bill includes \$55,000, the amount of the request, and a reduction of \$215,000 under the amount that was appropriated for fiscal year 1957.

Construction, treatment and cafeteria building.—The bill includes \$180,000, the amount of the request, to start planning a new treatment and cafeteria building which will replace a treatment facility built in 1871, and provide a much-needed cafeteria. It was testified that this replacement is not intended to increase the number of beds for which space will be provided.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.—The bill includes \$130,000,000, a reduction of \$1,000,000 from the request and an increase of \$33,000,000 over the amount now appropriated for 1957. There is pending before the Committee a recent request to appropriate an additional \$24,500,000, for fiscal year 1957 and, from information submitted in connection with the request for 1958, it is very doubtful if much reduction can safely be made in the supplemental request. Of course the supplemental appropriation will reduce by the same amount the increase shown above.

The 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act added very greatly to the workload of this bureau. Even with working personnel on a regular overtime basis it has been impossible to prevent the backlog of work from building up. At the present time it is taking an average of 60 days from the time a claim is received until it is processed for payment. The standards which the Bureau has sought to maintain in the past, and which the Committee has urged be maintained, is a maximum of 30 days. In view of the situation which exists with regard to workload, the Committee has approved practically the entire amount requested. These funds all come out of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund rather than from the general fund of the Treasury.

Grants to States for Public Assistance.—The bill includes \$1,600,000,000, a reduction of \$79,400,000 from the amount of the request, and an increase of \$25,000,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The Department's estimate was that Public assistance would cost the Federal Government over \$100,000,000 more than will be required for fiscal year 1957. It appeared to the Committee that the Department's estimates fail to take into adequate consideration the fact that the social security insurance program has been further liberalized and should result in some reduction in public assistance rolls. Another important factor that was apparently given little or no consideration is that the expanding Vocational Rehabilitation Program is rehabilitating more and more persons who are on public assistance rolls and thus reducing the requirements for these funds. The Committee has been very liberal in approving the requests for expansion of the Vocational Rehabilitation Program. The committee is convinced that if the Department properly coordinates all of these programs and actively

works with the States in attempting to reduce public assistance rolls wherever feasible, that the amount provided in the Bill will be adequate. The Committee also continued the limitation on State and local administrative costs by placing a limitation of \$104,000,000 in the bill. The estimate presented to the Committee was that these costs would require grants of \$104,500,000 if no limitation were imposed.

Grants to States for training public welfare personnel.—The request for \$2,500,000 to start this proposed new program has been disallowed.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.—The bill includes \$2,000,000, a reduction of \$216,000 from the request, and an increase of \$252,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase will provide for increases in mandatory costs of approximately \$100,000, and about \$152,000 for personnel and related expenses necessary in working with the States on the public assistance programs generally.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.—The bill includes \$2,000,000, a reduction of \$154,000 from the request, and an increase of \$178,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase provided is sufficient to cover increases in mandatory costs of approximately \$100,000, and a few small increases such as the expense of planning for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.—The bill includes \$41,500,000, the amount of the request, and \$2,139,000 over the amount appropriated over 1957. The total amount in the bill includes \$16,500,000 for maternal and child health services, \$15,000,000 for crippled children services, and \$10,000,000 for child welfare services. In each of the first two categories the amounts are equal to the maximum which is authorized to be appropriated. The amount for Child Welfare Services is \$2,000,000 below the maximum authorization of \$12,000,000, but is equal to the maximum authorization prior to the 1956 amendments and is \$1,639,000 over the amount provided for 1957.

Cooperative research or demonstration projects in social security.—The request for \$2,080,000 for this proposed new activity has been disallowed.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner.—The bill includes \$300,000 as a direct appropriation and authorizes the transfer of \$240,000 from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, a reduction of \$15,000 and \$4,000 respectively from the request, and an increase of \$88,000 and \$80,000 respectively above the amounts provided for 1957. Recent amendments to the Social Security legislation have added considerably to its scope and complexity and so to the work that should be done in the Office of the Commissioner, yet this office is considerably smaller now than it was 10 years ago. While the Committee is not in favor of going back to the type of office that was maintained then, it is convinced that the present Commissioner is sincerely attempting to do a good job with inadequate facilities.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary.—The bill includes a direct appropriation of \$1,800,000 and an authorization to transfer \$260,000 from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, a reduction of \$215,000 and \$22,000 respectively from the request, and an increase of \$212,000 and \$35,000 respectively above the amount appropriated for 1957. The Secretary requested a substantial increase a year ago for the fiscal year 1957. This Committee granted that increase in full and it was subsequently approved by both Houses of Congress. The Committee was not convinced that conditions have changed sufficiently during the last year to warrant another increase as substantial as was requested. The amount included in the bill is sufficient to cover all increases in mandatory costs and will provide about \$100,000 for increases in staff and related expenses.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration.—The bill includes \$2,300,000 as a direct appropriation and authorizes \$700,000 to be transferred from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, a reduction of \$55,000 and \$8,000 respectively from the request, and an increase of \$315,000 and \$200,000 respectively above the appropriation for 1957. Most of the increase was requested for grant-in-aid auditors necessary because of the increases in the grant-in-aid programs and for additional personnel to handle such work as voucher review, payrolling, etc., for the additional personnel in the field to administer the new and expanded programs authorized by the last session of Congress. This increase in personnel is primarily attributable to the large increase in the field personnel of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance necessary to administer the expanded social security insurance program. The Committee has allowed all of the increase requested in these two categories. The request for five additional administrative officers and five additional secretaries for strengthening five Regional Director's immediate offices has not been allowed.

On several occasions in recent years, the Committee has asked why the auditors under this office do not audit claims paid under the appropriation "Payments to School Districts". In the opinion of the Committee, a satisfactory answer has never been given. It is, therefore, requested that a few spotcheck audits be made during the ensuing fiscal year and that a report on the findings be made to the Committee. This should of course be a strictly random sample and it is not the desire of the Committee that more than a 10 percent sample be audited.

During the last few years the Committee has also attempted, without success, to secure a logical explanation of why this office feels that it can perform, in the Regional Offices, such common services as voucher review, payrolling, processing personnel actions, etc. for other field offices of the Department more efficiently than the bureaus can perform these services themselves; while at the same time some, such as the Food and Drug Administration, and the Foreign Quarantine Service, perform these functions on a centralized basis. It is the

desire of the Committee that a serious study of this matter be made during the next year and that appropriations for 1959 reflect transfers of these activities to the Office of Field Services if, as has been claimed, this office can do the job more efficiently.

Office of the General Counsel.—The bill includes \$500,000 as a direct appropriation and authorizes transfers from trust funds in the amount of \$450,000, a reduction of \$59,000 and \$27,000 respectively from the request, and an increase of \$74,000 and \$30,900 respectively above the amounts appropriated for 1957. There has been very little increase in this office for the last several years and there is no doubt that the new programs which have been added in these years have substantially increased the amount of legal work which it is necessary to accomplish. The amount provided will cover mandatory cost increases and about \$50,000 for additional personnel and related expenses. In the opinion of the Committee, this increase will be needed primarily in connection with Food and Drug Administration activities which will be increased considerably under the appropriation recommended in the bill.

Surplus property utilization.—The bill includes \$502,000, the amount of the request, and \$52,000 over the appropriation for 1957. Activities under this appropriation render an obviously valuable service for educational and public health institutions. It is also worthy of mention that the compliance work under this program results in the collection of more funds for deposit to the Treasury than is appropriated for the expenses of all activities under this head.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$9,450,000, a reduction of \$125,000 from the request, and an increase of \$498,500 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The amount recommended in the bill is sufficient to pay mandatory cost increases and thus continue activities in 1958 on the same level as 1957. The bill will not provide for any additional personnel.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$520,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$60,000 over the appropriation for 1957. No new positions are provided for in the bill.

Arbitration and emergency boards.—The bill includes \$250,000, the amount of the request, and the same amount as was appropriated for this purpose in 1957.

National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$525,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$23,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The amount recommended will cover mandatory cost increases and a small increase for printing decisions of the Board.

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$8,150,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$1,150,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. This increase is necessary because of the amend-

ments to the Social Security Act and the amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, passed during the last session of Congress, both of which added to the workload. There is now pending before the Committee a recently submitted request for a supplemental appropriation of \$600,000 for fiscal year 1957. To the extent this is granted, the increase over 1957 provided by the amount recommended in the bill, will be reduced. Approximately \$400,000 is required in 1958 for increases in mandatory costs such as contribution to the Civil Service Retirement Fund.

All of these funds come from the Railroad Retirement Trust Fund rather than from the general funds of the Federal Treasury.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$3,550,000, a reduction of \$60,000 from the request, and an increase of \$255,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. The increase provided is approximately equal to the increases in mandatory costs in 1958. No additional positions are provided.

TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Federal contribution.—The bill includes the usual \$5,000 contribution to the Commission. No increase was requested.

TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Maintenance and operation.—The bill contains \$4,750,000, the amount of the request, and \$1,814,000 less than the appropriation for 1957. The reduction is accounted for by the reduction in construction funds. The appropriation for 1957 included \$2,200,000 to complete construction of the "service center". Only \$34,000 is estimated for construction for fiscal year 1958.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On pages 2 and 3, in connection with "Office of the Secretary", Department of Labor:

Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet, in whole or in part, the requirements of the Department; and (4) telephone, mail and messenger services: Provided, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order on June 30, 1957, shall be used to capitalize such fund: Provided further, That the fund may be used to finance the cost of centralized procurement of supplies and equipment and that the fund shall be

reimbursed in advance from available funds of bureaus, offices, and agencies for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operations, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment.

On page 20, in connection with "President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Provided, That none of these funds shall be available after December 31, 1957, except for liquidation purposes.

On page 32 in connection with "Grants to States for public assistance", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Provided further, That none of the amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1, 1957.

On pages 38 and 39 in connection with "General provisions", Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

SEC. 209. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of the direct costs.

SEC. 210. None of the obligational authority available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for planning and/or construction of buildings shall remain available after June 30, 1959.

SEC. 211. None of the funds provided herein shall be used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone in connection with the construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Increase (+), decrease (-)
Office of Education:			
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907) -----	\$2, 550, 000	\$2, 550, 000	-----
Payments to States for promotion of vocational education (act of Feb. 23, 1917) -----	7, 138, 331	7, 138, 331	-----
Total -----	9, 688, 331	9, 688, 331	-----

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1937	Estimates, 1938	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees Compensation:			
Relief and rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended-----	\$35, 000	\$35, 000	-----
Relief and rehabilitation, Workmen's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia-----	5, 000	5, 000	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work-----	46, 879	-----	-\$46, 879
Total, Department of Labor-----	86, 879	40, 000	-46, 879
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Patients' benefit fund, Public Health Service hospitals-----	20, 000	20, 000	-----
Public Health Service conditional gift fund-----	50, 000	15, 000	-35, 000
Public Health Service unconditional gift fund-----	12, 000	12, 000	-----
St. Elizabeths Hospital patients' benefit fund-----	5, 100	300	--4, 800
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	87, 100	47, 300	-39, 800
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account-----	768, 800, 000	775, 500, 000	+6, 700, 000
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration Fund-----	7, 241, 543	7, 873, 862	+632, 319
Total, Railroad Retirement Board-----	776, 041, 543	783, 373, 862	+7, 332, 319
SOLDIERS' HOME			
Soldiers' Home permanent fund-----	6, 500	6, 500	-----
Total trust funds, all agencies-----	776, 222, 022	783, 467, 662	+7, 245, 640

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1957, ESTIMATES FOR 1958, AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1958

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Recommended in bill for 1958	Bill compared with—	
				1957 appropriation	1958 estimates
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 751, 000	\$1, 619, 000	\$1, 510, 000	—\$241, 000	—\$109, 000
Revolving fund-----	-----	150, 000	-----	-----	—150, 000
Total, Office of the Secretary-----	1, 751, 000	1, 769, 000	1, 510, 000	—241, 000	—259, 000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 021, 000	2, 263, 000	2, 225, 000	+204, 000	—38, 000
Transfer from highway trust fund-----	[300, 000]	[365, 000]	[365, 000]	[+65, 000]	[-----]
Total, Office of the Solicitor-----	2, 021, 000	2, 263, 000	2, 225, 000	+204, 000	—38, 000
BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS					
Salaries and expenses-----	911, 500	1, 167, 000	1, 031, 300	+119, 800	—135, 700
BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS					
Salaries and expenses-----	383, 000	542, 000	542, 000	+159, 000	-----
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP					
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 399, 000	3, 940, 000	3, 600, 000	+201, 000	—340, 000

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
Salaries and expenses-----	5, 558, 000	6, 358, 000	6, 000, 000	+442, 000	-358, 000
Grants to States-----	250, 000, 000	270, 000, 000	262, 000, 000	+12, 000, 000	-8, 000, 000
Unemployment compensation for veterans--	70, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	36, 800, 000	-33, 200, 000	-5, 200, 000
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees-----	25, 000, 000	32, 000, 000	26, 500, 000	+1, 500, 000	-5, 500, 000
Mexican farm labor program-----	2, 125, 000	2, 683, 000	2, 500, 000	+375, 000	-183, 000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security-----	352, 683, 000	353, 041, 000	333, 800, 000	-18, 883, 000	-19, 241, 000
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 347, 000	2, 838, 000	2, 838, 000	+491, 000	-----
Transfer from war claims fund-----	[78, 500]	[-----]	[-----]	[-78, 500]	[-----]
Transfer from longshoremen's and harbor workers trust fund-----	[47, 000]	[47, 400]	[47, 400]	[+400]	[-----]
Employees' compensation fund (indefinite) -	[50, 000, 000]	[50, 350, 000]	[50, 350, 000]	[+350, 000]	[-----]
Total, Bureau of Employees' Compensation-----	2, 347, 000	2, 838, 000	2, 838, 000	+491, 000	-----
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS					
Salaries and expenses-----	6, 887, 000	7, 768, 000	7, 470, 000	+583, 000	-298, 000
WOMEN'S BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses-----	403, 000	462, 000	462, 000	+59, 000	-----

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Recommended in bill for 1958	Bill compared with—	
				1957 appropriation	1958 estimates
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$10, 000, 000	\$10, 888, 000	\$10, 888, 000	+ \$888, 000	-----
Total, Department of Labor-----	380, 785, 500	384, 678, 000	364, 366, 300	- 16, 419, 200	- \$20, 311, 700

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND					
Education of the blind-----	\$230, 000	\$328, 000	\$328, 000	+ \$98, 000	-----
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	6, 779, 000	9, 300, 000	9, 300, 000	+ 2, 521, 000	-----
Certification and inspection services-----	[1, 200, 000]	[1, 254, 500]	[1, 254, 500]	[+ 54, 500]	[-----]
Total, Food and Drug Administration-----	6, 779, 000	9, 300, 000	9, 300, 000	+ 2, 521, 000	-----
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL					
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 755, 000	3, 032, 000	3, 000, 000	+ 245, 000	- \$32, 000

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Recommended in bill for 1958	Bill compared with—	
				1957 appropriation	1958 estimates
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION					
Grants to States and other agencies-----	\$38, 000, 000	\$45, 100, 000	\$45, 100, 000	+\$7, 100, 000	-----
Training and traineeships-----	2, 950, 000	4, 400, 000	4, 400, 000	+1, 450, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 160, 000	1, 445, 000	1, 330, 000	+170, 000	-\$115, 000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation-----	42, 110, 000	50, 945, 000	50, 830, 000	+8, 720, 000	-115, 000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Assistance to States, general-----	17, 591, 000	24, 609, 000	19, 592, 000	+2, 001, 000	-5, 017, 000
Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska-----	1, 170, 000	2, 165, 000	2, 165, 000	+995, 000	-----
Construction of mental health facilities, Territory of Alaska-----					-----
Venereal diseases-----	4, 195, 000	4, 415, 000	4, 415, 000	+220, 000	-----
Tuberculosis-----	6, 660, 000	7, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	+340, 000	-----
Communicable diseases-----	5, 750, 000	6, 260, 000	6, 200, 000	+450, 000	-60, 000
Sanitary engineering activities-----	9, 000, 000	13, 063, 000	12, 640, 000	+3, 640, 000	-423, 000

Grants for waste treatment works construction-----	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	-----
Grants for hospital construction-----	125,000,000	121,200,000	121,200,000	-3,800,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services-----	1,381,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	+69,000
Hospitals and medical care-----	39,011,000	44,399,000	44,399,000	+5,388,000
Foreign Quarantine Service-----	3,315,000	4,026,000	3,876,000	+561,000
Indian health activities-----	38,775,000	43,990,000	40,000,000	+1,225,000
Construction of Indian health facilities-----	8,762,000	5,800,000	3,096,000	-5,666,000
National Institutes of Health:				
General research and services-----	12,122,000	14,026,000	14,026,000	+1,904,000
National Cancer Institute-----	48,432,000	46,902,000	46,902,000	-1,530,000
Mental health activities-----	35,197,000	35,217,000	35,217,000	+20,000
National Heart Institute-----	33,396,000	33,436,000	33,436,000	+40,000
Dental health activities-----	6,026,000	6,430,000	6,430,000	+404,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities-----	15,885,000	17,885,000	17,885,000	+2,000,000
Allergy and infectious disease activities-----	13,299,000	17,400,000	17,400,000	+4,101,000
Neurology and blindness activities-----	18,650,000	18,887,000	18,887,000	+237,000
Grants for construction of research facilities-----	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-----

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Recommended in bill for 1958	Bill compared with—	
				1957 appropriation	1958 estimates
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—continued					
National Institutes of Health—Continued					
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory-----	\$147, 000			—\$147, 000	
Construction of animal quarters-----	1, 371, 000			—1, 371, 000	
Construction of dental research building-----	200, 000			—200, 000	
Construction of surgical facilities-----	1, 630, 000			—1, 630, 000	
Construction of general office building-----	300, 000			—300, 000	
Subtotal, National Institute of Health-----	216, 655, 000	\$220, 183, 000	\$220, 183, 000	+3, 528, 000	
National Library of Medicine (operating expenses)-----		1, 450, 000	1, 450, 000	+1, 450, 000	
Construction of library facilities-----	350, 000			—350, 000	
Retired pay of commissioned officers-----	1, 450, 000	1, 570, 000	[1, 570, 000]	—1, 450, 000	—\$1, 570, 000
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 892, 000	5, 150, 000	5, 100, 000	+1, 208, 000	—50, 000
Total, Public Health Service-----	532, 957, 000	556, 730, 000	542, 766, 000	+9, 809, 000	—13, 964, 000

ST. ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses-----	2, 737, 000	3, 265, 000	3, 000, 000	+ 263, 000	- 265, 000
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds-----	270, 000	55, 000	55, 000	- 215, 000	-----
Construction and equipment, maximum security building-----	6, 821, 000	-----	-----	- 6, 821, 000	-----
Construction, treatment and cafeteria building-----	-----	180, 000	180, 000	+ 180, 000	-----
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital-----	9, 828, 000	3, 500, 000	3, 235, 000	- 6, 593, 000	- 265, 000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance-----	[97, 000, 000]	[131, 000, 000]	[130, 000, 000]	[+ 33, 000, 000]	[- 1, 000, 000]
Grants to States for public assistance-----	1, 575, 000, 000	1, 679, 400, 000	1, 600, 000, 000	+ 25, 000, 000	- 79, 400, 000
Grants to States for training of public welfare personnel-----	-----	2, 500, 000	-----	-----	- 2, 500, 000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance-----	1, 748, 000	2, 216, 000	2, 000, 000	+ 252, 000	- 216, 000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau--	1, 822, 000	2, 154, 000	2, 000, 000	+ 178, 000	- 154, 000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare-----	39, 361, 000	41, 500, 000	41, 500, 000	+ 2, 139, 000	-----
Cooperative research or demonstration projects in social security-----	-----	2, 080, 000	-----	-----	- 2, 080, 000

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Recommended in bill for 1958	Bill compared with—	
				1957 appropriation	1958 estimates
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—con.					
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner:					
Appropriation.....	\$212, 000	\$315, 000	\$300, 000	+ \$88, 000	— \$15, 000
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[160, 000]	[244, 000]	[240, 000]	[+ 80, 000]	[— 4, 000]
Total, Social Security Administration.....	1, 618, 143, 000	1, 730, 165, 000	1, 645, 800, 000	+ 27, 657, 000	— 84, 365, 000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation.....	1, 588, 000	2, 015, 000	1, 800, 000	+ 212, 000	— 215, 000
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[225, 000]	[282, 000]	[260, 000]	[+ 35, 000]	[— 22, 000]
Office of Field Administration:					
Appropriation.....	1, 985, 000	2, 355, 000	2, 300, 000	+ 315, 000	— 55, 000
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[500, 000]	[708, 000]	[700, 000]	[+ 200, 000]	[— 8, 000]

Office of the General Counsel:

Appropriation-----	426, 000	559, 000	500, 000	+74, 000	-59, 000
Transfers-----	[419, 100]	[477, 000]	[450, 000]	[+30, 900]	[-27, 000]
Surplus property utilization-----	450, 000	502, 000	502, 000	+52, 000	-----
Total, Office of the Secretary-----	4, 449, 000	5, 431, 000	5, 102, 000	+653, 000	-329, 000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	2, 487, 062, 781	2, 582, 114, 581	2, 483, 836, 581	-3, 226, 200	-98, 278, 000

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$8, 951, 500	\$9, 575, 000	\$9, 450, 000	+\$498, 500	-\$125, 000
----------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------	-------------

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$460, 000	\$520, 000	\$520, 000	+\$60, 000	-----
Arbitration and emergency boards-----	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000	-----	-----
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses-----	502, 000	525, 000	525, 000	+23, 000	-----
Total, National Mediation Board-----	1, 212, 000	1, 295, 000	1, 295, 000	+83, 000	-----

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation)-----	[\$7, 000, 000]	[\$8, 150, 000]	[\$8, 150, 000]	[+\$1, 150, 000]	[-----]
--	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	---------

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Recommended in bill for 1958	Bill compared with—	
				1957 appropriation	1958 estimates
Salaries and expenses-----	\$3, 295, 000	\$3, 610, 000	\$3, 550, 000	+\$255, 000	—\$60, 000
Boards of inquiry-----	10, 000	-----	-----	—10, 000	-----
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service-----	3, 305, 000	3, 610, 000	3, 550, 000	+\$245, 000	—60, 000

TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Federal contribution-----	\$5, 000	\$5, 000	\$5, 000	-----	-----
---------------------------	----------	----------	----------	-------	-------

TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Maintenance and operation-----	[\$6, 564, 000]	[\$4, 750, 000]	[\$4, 750, 000]	[-\$1, 814, 000]	[------]
Grand total, all titles of the bill----	2, 881, 321, 781	2, 981, 277, 581	2, 862, 502, 881	—18, 818, 900	—\$118, 774, 700

Union Calendar No. 63

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6287

[Report No. 217]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 21, 1957

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and
6 related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958,
7 namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; and purchase of uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); \$1,510,000, of which not more than \$200,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet, in whole or in part, the requirements of the Department; and (4) telephone, mail and messenger services: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order on June 30, 1957, shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That the fund may be used to finance the cost of centralized procurement

1 of supplies and equipment and that the fund shall be reim-
2 bursed in advance from available funds of bureaus, offices,
3 and agencies for which services are performed at rates which
4 will return in full all expenses of operations, including re-
5 serves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equip-
6 ment.

7 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
9 Office of the Solicitor, \$2,225,000, together with not to ex-
10 ceed \$365,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund
11 created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of
12 1956.

13 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
15 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and
16 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-
17 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Fed-
18 eral Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C.
19 784 (c)) ; performance of the functions vested in the Sec-
20 retary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act,
21 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not less than
22 \$182,575 for the work of the President's Committee on
23 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as
24 authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat.
25 409) : *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for

1 the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or
2 transfer to any other department or agency under the pro-
3 visions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and
4 of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attend-
5 ance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences
6 concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards;
7 \$1,031,300.

8 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render
10 assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment
11 rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service
12 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the
13 Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended (50 U. S. C.
14 App. 351), the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel
15 Service Law of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 401),
16 and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service
17 Act (50 U. S. C. App. 459), and the Reserve Forces Act
18 of 1955 (69 Stat. 598), \$542,000.

19 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
21 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
22 tice training, as authorized by the Acts of March 4, 1913 (5
23 U. S. C. 611), and August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50),
24 \$3,600,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$6,000,000, of which \$1,125,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment, and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses including purchasing and installing of air-conditioning equipment in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of

1 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
2 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Read-
3 justment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684) and title
4 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1130),
5 \$262,000,000, of which \$12,000,000 shall be available
6 only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary
7 to meet increased costs of administration resulting from
8 changes in a State law or increases in the numbers
9 of claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs
10 resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans
11 embracing employees of the State generally over those upon
12 which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the
13 District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of
14 administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary
15 adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision
16 to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security
17 Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time
18 to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment
19 to each State found to be in compliance with the require-
20 ments of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of
21 Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, with the provi-
22 sions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended,
23 such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper
24 and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation
25 law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*,

1 That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Depart-
2 ment of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used
3 for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly
4 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail
5 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-
6 ment compensation systems and employment services by
7 States receiving grants herefrom.

8 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
9 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
10 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
11 maintenance of personnel standards on the merit basis, shall
12 apply.

13 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
14 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
15 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
16 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
17 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
18 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
19 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
20 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
21 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
22 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
23 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
24 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

25 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For

1 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
2 to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as
3 amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended,
4 for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such
5 sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
6 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
7 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
8 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

9 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
10 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of
11 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
12 \$36,800,000.

13 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
14 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
15 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV of
16 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
17 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
18 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
19 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
20 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

21 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees:
22 For payments to unemployed Federal employees, either di-
23 rectly or through payments to States, as authorized by title
24 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$26,500,000.

1 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees,
 2 next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of
 3 the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized
 4 by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, such
 5 amounts as may be required for payment to unemployed
 6 Federal employees for the first quarter of the next succeeding
 7 fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder
 8 shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal
 9 year.

10 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
 11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
 12 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under
 13 the Act of July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119), as amended,
 14 including temporary employment of persons without regard
 15 to the civil service laws, \$2,500,000.

16 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
 18 expenses and not to exceed \$113,400 for the Employees'
 19 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,838,000, together with
 20 not to exceed \$47,400 to be derived from the fund created
 21 by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers'
 22 Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906).

23 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
 24 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-

1 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
2 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
3 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
4 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau
5 of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of
6 benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War
7 Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation
8 Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of
9 recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical
10 and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral
11 and burial expenses, including transportation and other ex-
12 penses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial,
13 for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were
14 certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital
15 services and treatment at Government expense on June 30,
16 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian
17 employees of the United States, and the limitations and
18 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended
19 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,
20 treatment, and expenses in such cases and for payments pur-
21 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act
22 of 1948 (50 U. S. C., app. 2012) ; such amount as may be
23 required during the current fiscal year.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$7,470,000.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$462,000.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$10,888,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1958".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101–105), \$328,000.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301–392) ; the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41–50) ; the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141–149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401–411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as

1 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; reporting and illustrating
2 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-
3 ratus, and scientific equipment; payment in advance for
4 special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees,
5 travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new
6 developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement
7 operations; \$9,300,000.

8 Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and
9 other services: For expenses necessary for the certification
10 or inspection of certain products, and for the establishment
11 of tolerances for pesticides, in accordance with sections 406,
12 408, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal
13 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.
14 346, 346a, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the ag-
15 gregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal
16 year to cover payments of fees for services in connec-
17 tion with such certifications, inspections, or establishment of
18 tolerances, to remain available until expended. The total
19 amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal
20 services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific
21 equipment; expenses of advisory committees; and the refund
22 of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of

1 payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been
2 paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be
3 made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the
4 Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed
5 upon him by the foregoing proviso.

6 GALLAUDET COLLEGE

7 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Gal-
8 laudet College, including personal services and miscellaneous
9 expenses, and repairs and improvements, as authorized by
10 the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law 420), \$730,000:
11 *Provided*, That Gallaudet College shall be paid by the
12 District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each
13 quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per school year for each
14 student attending and receiving instruction in elementary
15 or secondary education pursuant to the Act of March 3,
16 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

17 Construction: For the construction and equipment of
18 buildings and facilities on the grounds of Gallaudet College,
19 as authorized by the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law
20 420), under the supervision of the General Services Admin-
21 istration, including planning, architectural, and engineering
22 services, \$1,690,000, to remain available until June 30,

1 1959, as follows: For a cafeteria and service building and a
2 men's dormitory, together with alterations, installations, and
3 equipment in connection with such construction, and for
4 beginning roads, walks, and grading in connection with such
5 construction.

6

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

7 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
8 Howard University, including personal services and mis-
9 cellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
10 \$3,800,000.

11 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans
12 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of
13 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of How-
14 ard University, of a physical education building and a home
15 economics building, \$150,000, to remain available until
16 June 30, 1959.

17 Construction of buildings: For equipping the dental
18 school building under the supervision of General Services
19 Administration, \$262,000, to remain available until June
20 30, 1959, and such amount shall be in addition to the
21 limitation of cost established by Public Law 452, Eighty-
22 second Congress.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 2), and section 202 of said Act (70 Stat. 925), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31), including \$4,000,000 for extension and improvement of practical nurse training, \$33,442,081: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under section 3 (a), (1), (2), (3), and (4) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$29,267,081 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount of allotment which States and Territories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,501,500.

1 Grants for library services: For grants to the States
2 pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1956, as amended (70 Stat.
3 293-296, 911), \$5,000,000.

4 Payments to school districts: For payments to local edu-
5 cational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
6 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as
7 amended (20 U. S. C. ch. 13; 70 Stat. 909, 970-972),
8 \$127,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also
9 be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of
10 such Act.

11 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
12 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
13 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized
14 by title III and title IV of the Act of September 23, 1950,
15 as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14; 70 Stat. 909, 968-969),
16 including not to exceed \$700,000 for necessary expenses of
17 technical services rendered by other agencies and not to
18 exceed \$5,000,000 for title IV, \$41,700,000, to remain
19 available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That no part of
20 this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
21 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and
22 Welfare.

23 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
24 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations,

1 and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of
2 public and school library service; coordination of library
3 service on the national level with other forms of adult educa-
4 tion; developing library participation in Federal projects;
5 fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among
6 libraries, interstate library coordination and the development
7 of library service throughout the country; purchase, distri-
8 bution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
9 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
10 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
11 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
12 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
13 and repairing the same; and cooperative research, surveys,
14 and demonstrations in education as authorized by the Act of
15 July 26, 1954 (20 U. S. C. 331-332) ; \$7,000,000,
16 of which not less than \$550,000 shall be available for
17 the Division of Vocational Education as authorized: *Pro-*
18 *vided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies represent-
19 ing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of
20 the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the
21 said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the
22 United States to the credit of this appropriation.

23 President's Committee on Education Beyond the High
24 School: For salaries and expenses for the President's Com-

1 mittee on Education Beyond the High School, including
2 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
3 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at
4 meetings, \$200,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds
5 shall be available after December 31, 1957, except for
6 liquidation purposes.

7 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

8 Grants to States and other agencies: For grants to
9 States and other agencies in accordance with the Voca-
10 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$45,100,000, of which
11 \$40,000,000 is for vocational rehabilitation services under
12 section 2 of said Act; \$1,500,000 is for extension and im-
13 provement projects under section 3 of said Act; and
14 \$3,600,000 is for special projects under section 4 of said
15 Act: *Provided*, That allotments under section 2 of said Act
16 to the States for the current fiscal year shall be made on
17 the basis of \$53,000,000, and this amount shall be con-
18 sidered the sum available for allotments under such section
19 for such fiscal year.

20 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
21 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, grants to States
22 under sections 2 and 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
23 as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding
24 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
25 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged

1 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*,
2 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall
3 not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter
4 of the current fiscal year.

5 Training and traineeships: For training and traineeships
6 pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
7 as amended, and for carrying out the training functions
8 provided for in section 7 of said Act, \$4,400,000.

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
10 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
11 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
12 U. S. C., ch. 6A), as amended, \$1,330,000.

13 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

14 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
15 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
16 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, in-
17 cluding expenses for active commissioned officers in the
18 Reserve Corps and for not to exceed one thousand six
19 hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps;
20 and except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September
21 30, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 236-244), for expenses of primary
22 and secondary schooling of dependents of Public Health
23 Service personnel stationed in foreign countries, in amounts
24 not to exceed an average of \$250 per student, when it is

1 determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, avail-
2 able in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the
3 education of such dependents, and for the transportation
4 of such dependents between such schools and their places
5 of residence when the schools are not accessible to such
6 dependents by regular means of transportation; and for
7 the payment of compensation to consultants or individual
8 scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to
9 section 207 (e) or section 207 (f) of the Act at rates
10 established by the Surgeon General not to exceed \$15,000
11 per annum; as follows:

12 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
13 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c)
14 of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pur-
15 suant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations
16 and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; to
17 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,
18 and vital statistics; to provide traineeships pursuant to sec-
19 tion 306 of the Act; and not to exceed \$1,000 for enter-
20 tainment of officials of other countries when specifically
21 authorized by the Surgeon General; \$19,592,000.

22 Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska: To en-
23 able the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to
24 cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the con-
25 duct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention,

1 treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and
2 maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to
3 and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314
4 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f),
5 (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c)
6 of such section), 361, 363, and 371 of the Act, including
7 the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the
8 purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings,
9 \$2,165,000.

10 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
11 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
12 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
13 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
14 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
15 ment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act.
16 and with the approval of the respective State health author-
17 ities, to counties, health districts, and other political sub-
18 divisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
19 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
20 General may determine; \$4,415,000.

21 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
22 (b) of the Act, \$7,000,000, of which not less than
23 \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States,
24 to be matched by an equal amount of State and local
25 funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of

1 prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees,
2 and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and
3 case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used
4 directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but ex-
5 cluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria.

6 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
7 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and
8 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
9 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate
10 transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
11 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,
12 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$6,200,000.

13 Sanitary engineering activities: For expenses, not other-
14 wise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of
15 sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the Act relating
16 to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, in-
17 cluding enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and inter-
18 state quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the pur-
19 poses of the Acts of July 14, 1955 (Public Law 159), and
20 July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), including \$2,700,000 for
21 grants to States and \$300,000 for grants to interstate agen-
22 cies; and the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;
23 \$12,640,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958.

1 Grants for waste treatment works construction: For
2 payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control
3 Act, as amended, \$50,000,000, to remain available only
4 until June 30, 1959.

5 Grants for hospital construction: For payments under
6 parts C and G, title VI, of the Act, as amended, \$121,-
7 200,000, of which \$99,000,000 shall be for payments for
8 hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,200,-
9 000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636 of
10 the Act, and \$21,000,000 shall be for payments for facili-
11 ties pursuant to part G, as follows: \$6,500,000 for diag-
12 nostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the
13 chronically ill and impaired, \$4,000,000 for rehabilitation
14 facilities, and \$4,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided*, That
15 allotments under such parts C and G to the several States
16 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of
17 amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

18 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
19 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
20 of the Act, as amended, \$1,450,000.

21 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
22 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August
23 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), under the Dependents' Medical

1 Care Act (70 Stat. 250-254), and under sections 307, 321,
2 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and
3 810 of the Public Health Service Act, Private Law 419
4 of the Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and Executive
5 Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and
6 exchange of farm products and livestock; conducting research
7 on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative
8 nursing services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;
9 \$44,399,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively avail-
10 able for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and
11 treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That
12 when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a
13 health service program for any department or agency, pay-
14 ment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for
15 deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

16 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
17 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-
18 ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
19 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
20 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
21 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
22 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
23 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-
24 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
25 required by law of such countries, \$3,876,000.

1 Indian health activities: For expenses necessary to enable
2 the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of
3 August 5, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 2001), including services as
4 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
5 U. S. C. 55a) (including not to exceed \$10,000 for such
6 services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals,
7 when authorized by the Surgeon General) ; hire of passenger
8 motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment
9 for telephone service in private residences in the field, when
10 authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and
11 the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public
12 Health Service Act; \$40,000,000.

13 Construction of Indian health facilities: For construc-
14 tion, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health
15 and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for per-
16 sonnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings;
17 acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable build-
18 ings; and purchase of trailers; \$3,096,000, to remain avail-
19 able until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That such expenditures
20 may be made through the Department of the Interior.

21 National Institutes of Health, general research and
22 services: For the activities of the National Institutes of
23 Health, not otherwise provided for, including research
24 fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to sec-
25 tion 301 of the Act; regulation and preparation of biologic

1 products, and conduct of research related thereto; not to ex-
2 ceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when
3 specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of
4 temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chem-
5 ical substances for demonstrations and research; \$14,026,-
6 000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized
7 to advance to this appropriation from other appropriations
8 to the Public Health Service such amounts as are deter-
9 mined to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and
10 for activities performed on a centralized basis: *Provided*
11 *further*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate
12 facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of
13 meals to employees and others at rates determined by him to
14 be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the pro-
15 ceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.

16 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
17 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
18 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
19 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
20 State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit
21 institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of
22 cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations,
23 and grants-in-aid; and to contract for supplies and services
24 by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Re-
25 vised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy pro-

1 gram; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title
2 IV, part A, of the Act; \$46,902,000.

3 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
4 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 304,
5 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental
6 diseases, \$35,217,000.

7 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
8 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
9 \$33,436,000.

10 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
11 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
12 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
13 diseases and conditions, \$6,430,000.

14 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
15 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
16 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$17,885,000.

17 Allergy and infectious disease activities: For expenses,
18 not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the pur-
19 poses of the Act relating to allergy and infectious diseases,
20 \$17,400,000, of which \$150,000 shall be available for pay-
21 ment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and
22 operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

23 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-

1 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
2 neurology and blindness, \$18,887,000.

3 Grants for construction of health research facilities: For
4 grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of
5 1956, \$30,000,000.

6 National Library of Medicine: For expenses, not other-
7 wise provided for, necessary to carry out the National
8 Library of Medicine Act (70 Stat. 960), \$1,450,000.

9 Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of
10 commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments
11 under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of
12 1953, such amount as may be required during the current
13 fiscal year.

14 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
15 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous ex-
16 penses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
17 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and
18 publications related to public health; and conducting
19 studies and demonstrations in public health methods;
20 \$5,100,000.

21 ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
23 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including cloth-
24 ing for patients, and cooperation with organizations or

1 individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes,
2 prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$3,000,000.

3 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
4 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
5 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prepara-
6 tion of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision
7 of construction, \$55,000, to remain available until June 30,
8 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be
9 transferred to the General Services Administration.

10 Construction, treatment and cafeteria building: For
11 expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifi-
12 cations for a treatment and cafeteria building at Saint
13 Elizabeths Hospital, \$180,000, to remain available until
14 June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may
15 be transferred to General Services Administration.

16 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

17 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
18 Insurance: For necessary expenses, not more than
19 \$130,000,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age
20 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That such
21 amounts as are required shall be available to pay the cost
22 of necessary travel incident to medical examinations for
23 verifying disabilities of individuals who file applications for
24 disability determinations under title II of the Social Security
25 Act, as amended.

1 Advances to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
2 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, advances to
3 States under section 221 (e) of the Social Security Act, as
4 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
5 year, such sums as may be necessary from the above author-
6 ization may be expended from the Federal old-age and
7 survivors insurance trust fund.

8 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
9 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid
10 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
11 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social
12 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
13 X, and XIV), \$1,600,000,000, of which such amount as
14 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period
15 in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year:
16 *Provided*, That not more than \$104,000,000 of the amount
17 herein appropriated shall be used for expenses of State and
18 local administration: *Provided further*, That none of the
19 amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs
20 of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1,
21 1957.

22 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For

1 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
2 \$2,000,000.

3 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
4 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
5 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
6 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
7 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-
8 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
9 \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation
10 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
11 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the
12 care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
13 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
14 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
15 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
16 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund,
17 so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
18 That any State plan which provides standards for professional
19 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
20 shall be approved.

21 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
22 grants to States for maternal and child-health services,
23 services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as

1 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
2 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
3 \$41,500,000, of which \$15,000,000 shall be available for
4 services for crippled children, \$16,500,000 for maternal and
5 child-health services, and \$10,000,000 for child-welfare
6 services: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
7 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
8 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
9 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
10 estimated to be expended by the State: *Provided further*,
11 That \$1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502
12 (b) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for
13 mentally retarded children.

14 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
15 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of
16 Social Security, \$300,000, together with not to exceed
17 \$240,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
18 survivors insurance trust fund.

19 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
20 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
21 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, and section 705
22 of title VII, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as

1 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
2 year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations in-
3 curred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments
4 under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation
5 therefor for that fiscal year.

6 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
7 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
8 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in
9 the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
10 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to
11 a State plan approved under such title prior to or during
12 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect
13 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
14 such plan was submitted for approval.

15 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

16 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-
17 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,800,000,
18 together with not to exceed \$260,000 to be transferred from
19 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

20 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration:
21 For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Administration,
22 \$2,300,000, together with not to exceed \$700,000 to be

1 transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
2 trust fund.

3 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:
4 For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,
5 \$500,000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 to be trans-
6 ferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certi-
7 fication and inspection services", and not to exceed \$425,000
8 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors
9 insurance trust fund.

10 Surplus property utilization: For expenses necessary for
11 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j), (k), (n),
12 and (o), of the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-
13 ices Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real
14 and personal excess property for educational purposes and
15 protection of public health, \$502,000.

16 GENERAL PROVISIONS

17 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
18 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in
19 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organ-
20 izations whose publications are available to members only
21 or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

22 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
23 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as

1 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
2 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

3 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
4 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses
5 and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
6 the functions or activities for which such appropriations are
7 made.

8 SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for
9 salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or
10 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
11 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131).

12 SEC. 206. None of the funds appropriated by this title
13 to the Social Security Administration for grants-in-aid of
14 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
15 operation of said agencies, including the salaries and ex-
16 penses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be
17 withheld from the said agencies of any States which have
18 established by legislative enactment and have in operation
19 a merit system and classification and compensation plan
20 covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation
21 of their employees, because of any disapproval of their per-
22 sonnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of
23 the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or
24 employees.

1 SEC. 207. The Secretary is authorized to make such
2 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,
3 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
4 out the operations of the Department.

5 SEC. 208. Not to exceed \$2,500 of the funds available
6 to the Department for salaries and expenses and not other-
7 wise available for entertainment of officials of other countries
8 or officials of international organizations shall be available
9 for such entertainment when authorized by the Secretary.

10 SEC. 209. None of the funds provided herein shall be
11 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a
12 research project an amount for indirect expenses in con-
13 nection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of
14 the direct costs.

15 SEC. 210. None of the obligational authority available
16 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for
17 planning and/or construction of buildings shall remain avail-
18 able after June 30, 1959.

19 SEC. 211. None of the funds provided herein shall be
20 used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or plan-
21 ning of any building for the Department of Health, Educa-
22 tion, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor
23 shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the
24 salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone
25 in connection with the construction or planning of any

1 building for the Department of Health, Education, and
2 Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

3 This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,
4 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958".

5 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS

6 BOARD

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
8 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
9 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
10 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses
11 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the
12 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the
13 General Counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of
14 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and uniforms,
15 or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of Sep-
16 tember 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131) ;
17 \$9,450,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
18 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agri-
19 cultural laborers or used in connection with investiga-
20 tions, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining
21 units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to
22 in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U. S. C.
23 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations

1 Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of
2 June 25, 1938 (29 U. S. C. 203), and including in said
3 definition employees engaged in the maintenance and opera-
4 tion of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when
5 maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at
6 least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby
7 is used for farming purposes.

8 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
10 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
11 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
12 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$520,000.

13 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
14 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the
15 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and
16 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to
17 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including steno-
18 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the
19 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$250,000.

20 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

21 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
22 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
23 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
24 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$525,000, of which not
25 less than \$155,000 shall be available for compensation (at

1 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees
2 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
3 as amended.

4 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

5 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
6 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
7 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
8 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board,
9 when specifically authorized by the Board; stenographic
10 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
11 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and uniforms or allow-
12 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,
13 1954 (68 Stat. 1114) ; \$8,150,000, to be derived from the
14 railroad retirement account.

15 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND 16 CONCILIATION SERVICE

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
18 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
19 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180,
20 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
21 as provided in section 205 of said Act; expenses of boards of
22 inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206
23 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, concil-
24 iators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess

1 of \$75 per diem; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
2 for replacement only at not to exceed \$3,000; expenses of
3 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial
4 relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
5 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,550,000.

6 TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE
7 POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

8 Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac
9 River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to
10 pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac
11 River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses
12 of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the
13 administration of its business in the conservancy district
14 established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat.
15 748) , \$5,000.

16 TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

17 For maintenance and operation of the United States Sol-
18 diers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent
19 fund, \$4,750,000, of which \$34,000 shall remain available
20 until June 30, 1959 for construction of buildings and facili-
21 ties, including demolition: *Provided*, That this appropriation
22 shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of
23 members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at
24 rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the

1 Army, upon the recommendation of the Board of Commis-
2 sioners of the Home and the Surgeon General of the Army.

3 TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this
5 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not
6 authorized by the Congress.

7 This Act may be cited as the “Departments of Labor,
8 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act.
9 1958.”

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6287

[Report No. 217]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FOGARTY

MARCH 21, 1957

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 27, 1957
For actions of March 26, 1957
85th-1st, No. 52

CONTENTS

ACP.....7	Flood control.....8	Personnel.....16,20,27
Appropriations.....2,18,36	Forestry.....13,26	Plant pests.....12
Atomic energy.....24	Humane slaughter.....6	Price supports.....10
Banking and currency....35	Imports.....26	Property.....14,32
Budget.....16,18	Inflation.....16	Public Works.....8,15
Corn.....5,15,23	Information.....29,34	Reclamation.....28
Cost of living.....16	Insect control.....12	River compact.....31
Cotton.....10	Legislative program.....15	Statehood.....21
Cranberries.....30	Loans.....25	Surplus commodities.....11
Credit policies.....3	farm.....1,16	Taxation.....33
Dairy industry.....22	Natural resources.....4	Trade, foreign.....11,35
Exhibits.....29	Marketing.....30	Veterans' benefits.....25
Farm prices.....9	Minerals.....4,32	Water.....4,8,17
Farm program.....19		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported bills to limit price supports on extra-long staple cotton, extend Public Law 480, aid in plant pest control, exchange lands in Apache National Forest, and convey research station to U. of Mo. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House reported bill to extend FHA loans to desert-land entrymen.

HOUSE

1. FARM LOANS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 3753, to authorize this Department to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen (H. Rept. 272). p. 3932
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 3892-3921, 3924-25
3. CREDIT POLICIES. Rep. Patman spoke in favor of H. Res. 85, to authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to investigate national monetary and credit policies. This measure is to be debated today. pp. 3923, 3930-31, D246
4. NATURAL RESOURCES. Received a Nev. Legislature memorial requesting Interior to accelerate its activities in Nev. in making surveys and collecting information about mineral and water resources. p. 3934

5. CORN. Received a Nebr. Legislature memorial urging the President and Congress to resolve their differences without delay in connection with the corn program to be offered to farmers for 1957 inasmuch as planting season is now at hand and the farmer must know immediately in order to plan his operations accordingly. p. 3934
6. HUMANE SLAUGHTER. Received a local Penna. citizens petition urging the passage of legislation for the use of humane methods in the slaughter of meat animals. p. 3935
7. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM. As reported (see Digest 49), H.R. 1045 provides for Federal administration of ACP until such time as plans for State administration are submitted and approved. (Thus the bill would eliminate the necessity of periodic continuations of the authority for Federal administration of the program.)

SENATE

8. WATER RESOURCES; FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Johnson noted the importance of harnessing rainfall in Texas and inserted an article on the importance of flood detention dams to the flow of underground water. pp. 3839-40
Sen. Mansfield urged passage of S. J. Res. 12, to provide for transfer of right of way for the Yellowtail Dam and reservoir, and inserted his testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in support of the bill. pp. 3851-2
Received a N. Mex. House resolution urging a flood control and irrigation dam on the Gallinas River. p. 3841
Sen. Douglas submitted an amendment to S. 497, the public works bill, providing that the President should determine the 25% projects least essential in the national interest and defer them (pp. 3850-1). Sen. Johnson urged consideration of S. 497 on Wed., Mar. 27 (pp. 3853-4). Sen. Byrd announced his opposition to the omnibus public works bill and urged more study on the matter. pp. 3868-9
9. FARM PRICES. Sen. Murray presented a Mont. Legislature resolution urging an investigation of the spread between the price paid for livestock on the hoof and that paid for retail beef by the consumer. p. 3841
10. COTTON. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 812, to freeze the price supports for extra-long staple cotton at 75% of parity (S. Rept. 187). p. 3842
11. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1314, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 for one additional year to increase the authorization from \$3 billion to \$4 billion, and to permit barter with certain communist dominated countries (S. Rept. 188). p. 3842
12. INSECT CONTROL. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1442, to aid in the control of additional plant pests (S. Rept. 189). p. 3842
13. FORESTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 44, authorizing this Department to exchange certain lands in the Apache National Forest, N. Mex. (S. Rept. 190). p. 3842

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, as we continue to go forth into the hours of this new day, may we be humble and heroic in spirit, faithful and fruitful in service.

Deliver our minds and hearts from those fear-ridden cares and anxieties which wear us down and weaken our morale.

Help us to realize that, even though life today has in it many hard facts and tense experiences, we must not allow them to undermine our faith.

Give us the guidance of Thy spirit and may we follow the ways which Thou hast marked out for us for they are the ways of pleasantness and peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4939. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property of the United States located in Juneau, Alaska, known as the Juneau Subport of Embarkation, to the Territory of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1863. An act for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan;

H. R. 2046. An act for the relief of August J. Strigga; and

H. R. 3322. An act for the relief of James L. Bostwick.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 51. An act for the relief of Mary Barme and her two minor children, Steran Barme and Dinah Barme;

S. 58. An act for the relief of Duk Chang Cho;

S. 93. An act for the relief of Dominic Paul Steinhauer (Hiroshi Tsuruda);

S. 123. An act for the relief of Dr. James R. Wong;

S. 127. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino;

S. 332. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotments of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 424. An act for the relief of Herbert James Bramley;

S. 530. An act for the relief of Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung);

S. 689. An act for the relief of Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang;

S. 690. An act for the relief of Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsia;

S. 696. An act for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis;

S. 701. An act for the relief of Karl Eigil Engedal Hansen and his wife, Else Viola Agnethe Hansen, and their minor child, Jessie Engedal Hansen;

S. 718. An act for the relief of Erwin Wiedenhofer;

S. 731. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas;

S. 786. An act for the relief of Richard Rhen-Yang Lin and his wife, Julia Lam Lin;

S. 805. An act for the relief of Manuel Souza Novo;

S. 853. An act for the relief of Fethi Hepcaki;

S. 1098. An act for the relief of Stephen Kusang-Tao Hsu;

S. 1167. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulis;

S. 1179. An act for the relief of Harold George Jackson; and

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to implement further the act of July 15, 1946, by approving the signature by the Secretary of the Treasury of an agreement amending the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of December 6, 1945.

NATIONAL INVITATION BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT CHAMPIONS

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the new national invitation basketball tournament champions, the Bradley Braves, of Peoria, Ill. As a Bradley alumnus, I am particularly proud of the Braves' most recent achievement.

In winning the national invitation tournament at Madison Square Garden in New York last Saturday, the Braves broke 5 records; most points in 1 game—116; most points in 1 half—72; most free throws in 1 game—42; most points in 3-game series—294; and, in addition, broke the all-time garden college record for points scored in 1 game—116.

The Bradley coach, Mr. Chuck Orsborn, now in his first year as varsity mentor, is to be congratulated for the excellent manner in which he brought his boys along during the season and keyed them up for this championship tournament. Coach Orsborn was himself a star forward on Bradley's first "famous 5" team of the late thirties which won third place in the first NIT tournament in 1938.

The individual players are to be congratulated singularly for having conducted themselves as gentlemen and good sportsmen at all times both on and off the court. Theirs was a truly great team effort, as every man on the squad got to play in the tournament and scored at least two points.

It was, I am sure, a great thrill for the boys to win this one as it is the fruition of many a boyhood dream in high school to someday be able to play in the Garden in a championship tournament.

With All American Barney Cable, who averaged over 23 points a game, leading the way, the other boys who brought honor to themselves and credit to Bradley University are: Dick Dhabalt, Dave Emerson, Gene Herberger, Curley Johnson, Bobby Jo Mason, Wes Mason, Joe Billy McDade, Shellie McMillon, Gene Morse, John Myers, and Charles Sedgwick.

These young men, in this most recent National Invitation Tournament, have undoubtedly provided for the millions of courtside and television spectators, some of the greatest moments in sports history. Since 8 members of this fabulous group are juniors and 4 are sophomores, even greater achievements can be expected from Coach Chuck Orsborn and his Bradley Braves in years to come.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Anderson, Mont.	Diggs	Moulder
Andresen, August H.	Doyle	Patman
Aspinall	Eberharter	Pfost
Bass, N. H.	Frelinghuysen	Poage
Blitch	Grant	Powell
Bowler	Green, Pa.	Prouty
Boykin	Gregory	Rhee, Tenn.
Brown, Mo.	Gwinn	Rhodes, Pa.
Brownson	Henderson	Robeson, Va.
Buckley	Hillings	Scherer
Byrne, Pa.	Holtzman	Teller
Carrigg	Jackson	Thompson, N. J.
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Tollefson
Davis, Tenn.	McIntosh	Whitten
Dies	McMillan	Williams, N. Y.
	Magnuson	
	Meador	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see in the chair, presiding over the deliberations of this committee today, and perhaps tomorrow, the other half of the Rhode Island delegation, my colleague, AIME FORAND. I am sure, with the gentleman from Rhode Island in the chair, this bill will pass without too much difficulty.

I am privileged to report to the committee again this year on the requests for annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1958 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. This is the 11th year that I have appeared before the committee as a member of this subcommittee. This is the 7th year that I have appeared before the committee as chairman of the subcommittee to present the bill prepared by the subcommittee and approved by the full Committee on Appropriations.

First, I want to thank each and every member of the subcommittee for the fine support and cooperation they have shown me during the 6 or 7 weeks of hearings that have been held on this particular bill. We worked long days, meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning and go-

ing until 12:15 or 12:30, coming back at 1:30 and continuing until 4:30 or 5 o'clock. So it has been 6 or 7 long weeks of work.

On my side of the aisle the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is serving his third year on this subcommittee. He has certainly been a stalwart worker. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] is serving his fifth year on the subcommittee. He certainly knows all of the problems and programs of the agencies we have under discussion this afternoon.

As I said a year ago and 2 years ago, I was very pleased that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the senior member of the Committee on Appropriations on the Republican side, has seen fit to act as the ranking member of this subcommittee, and I have enjoyed immensely my work with JOHN TABER.

This year we had a new member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who worked as diligently as every one of the other members of the committee. I want to thank him for his help, cooperation, and attendance at these meetings.

Of course a committee such as we have could not operate unless we had a good right arm, and that right arm is Robert Moyer, who has been the clerk of this committee through both administrations now for 6 years. I do not know what the committee would do, and I am sure I do not know what I would do, unless we had the experienced help such as Bob Moyer has given this committee. Without him we could not issue the report we have given you this afternoon.

I suppose almost every subcommittee chairman will come up during the remainder of this Congress and say to the House, "This is a most difficult appropriation bill to cut." I have said this before on many, many occasions, and I believe it is true, that this is the most difficult appropriation bill to cut because it deals mainly and directly with the problems of human beings. Most of the huge expenditures carried in this bill are uncontrollable by the appropriating committees of Congress because Members of this House, in previous Congresses, have by your votes bound us in our actions as far as appropriating funds in many of the grant areas.

This year we are coming to you with a bill carrying a total figure of \$2,862,502,881. In 1957, the fiscal year in which we are now operating, there was appropriated \$2,881,321,781. The total carried in the bill is \$18,818,900 below what is available for the fiscal year 1957. The budget the President requested Congress to enact this year totaled \$2,981,277,581. We have allowed this year \$2,862,502,881, or a cut in the President's budget of about \$119 million.

Of this amount of \$2,800,000,000, almost \$2 billion is in uncontrollable items because of the actions of past Congresses in voting authorizations which establish what amounts to absolute requirements for appropriations.

In the Labor Department the grants to the States amount to 91 percent of the total budget. Only 9 percent is for ad-

ministration of the grants and other direct operations.

Also, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the grants to States, institutions, and individuals amount to 91 percent, and only 9 percent is for all direct operations. Out of that 9 percent, 7½ percent is for public health. So we have, in effect, only an area of 1½ percent of this budget for health, education, and welfare where there is any room for making reductions.

Let me remind you of what happened in that 84th Congress by a majority vote of the House and the other body and with the approval of the President of the United States.

First. You remember the social security act amendments a year ago? When that bill passed, it passed this House by an overwhelming majority. During our recent hearings one of the members of our subcommittee asked Mr. Schottland, the head of the Social Security Administration, "What will be the effect of the social security amendments that were voted upon last year?" His answer was "By 1960, the additional cost will amount to \$1,700,000,000." So when you voted for these social security amendments last year, you were voting to increase taxation \$1,700,000,000 in addition to what we had prior to the enactment of the social security amendments.

Second. Then another big item was the new Water Pollution Control Act. You know that that passed the House by an overwhelming majority.

Third. You have the Health Survey Act.

Fourth. The Library Services Act.

Fifth. The authorization for the President's Committee on Education beyond the high school.

Sixth. The national library of medicine.

Seventh. The health research facilities.

Eighth. Public Law 911 which took in four categories: Graduate training of professional public health personnel; advanced training of professional nurses; vocational educational for practical nurses; and authorization for special projects grants in the field of mental health.

Ninth. The Air Pollution Control Act.

That, in itself, is a pretty good reason why we carry some increases this year. The reason we are showing these increases is because the majority of you men and women here today voted to enact this legislation in the 84th Congress, and we are following out as a subcommittee on appropriations, and the full committee, the objectives of the previous Congress which voted overwhelmingly for the enactment of this kind of legislation.

In the bill itself, the first part is the Department of Labor. In my opinion, they have asked us for very conservative appropriations. One of the questions generally asked is on personnel. In the Department of Labor, the current employment as of the end of February was 5,160. The positions authorized in appropriations for 1957 total 5,420. The positions requested in 1958 were 5,710. The positions in the 1958 bill that we are

considering now amount to 5,533, or a decrease of 157 from the President's budget, and an increase of 133 over 1957. So, as far as the increase in personnel is concerned, even though we have saddled these administration agencies with bigger and bigger programs to work with by our votes in Congress, we have cut their requests for additional personnel by more than 50 percent in the Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What did the gentleman say the total increase will be? —

Mr. FOGARTY. One hundred and thirty-three—and we cut 157.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any breakdown as to the grades?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not have the grades at hand but we have them in the justifications, and they are in the hearings. Every position was justified by grade and duties.

Mr. GROSS. One hundred and fifty-three increase?

Mr. FOGARTY. One hundred and thirty-three increase, and a cut of 157 positions in the Department of Labor.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have allowed 1,086 more positions than authorized for 1957. And we have decreased their request by 1,025 positions, which is approximately a 50-percent cut in the increase that they asked for in personnel in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have a breakdown of those increases?

Mr. FOGARTY. I will get you the tables as soon as I finish.

At the beginning of the hearings, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, was our first witness. Even though he is a Republican, I must say he is trying to do a good job. I know all of you will not agree with that. There is some division of opinion between Democrats and Republicans and between labor and management, but he has been trying to do a decent job for all segments of our economy, and I think he should be commended. I did ask him, "There seems to be a great demand from Members of Congress and from people all over the country to cut the budget that we have before us. Now is there any place in this proposed budget that you are here justifying as far as the Department of Labor is concerned, that we can cut a position or one dime from?"

His answer was: "No; I don't believe it should be cut." He indicated further that they are doing the job that Congress has asked them to do. Many of the things that they are required to do, they are required to do because you people voted for these programs during the last couple of years in the 84th Congress. Many of you I know in the last election were going around bragging about what you had done for the laboring people of this country. If you want to continue to brag, we solicit your support today to stand by that pledge and support the budget requested by your administration with the adjustments made by the committee.

Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, appeared before our committee, and I think that he, too, is doing an excellent job as a member of the Cabinet. There may be some division of opinion among some of you because you may think he is too liberal. I do not think he is asking enough. I think he should have asked for more. And I think in some areas in the Department of Labor that the Secretary of Labor did not ask for enough. As far as Mr. Folsom is concerned, I think he could spend more money than he is asking for which would save the taxpayers many thousands of dollars in return—not only dollars but lives.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. We must realize that the gentleman from Rhode Island has a very difficult task before him in the presentation of this particular bill due to the human interest features in it. Referring, though, to this problem of personnel, I note that for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare their actual employment on the last day of last month, that is, February 28, was 28,041 employees. In the authorization for the fiscal year 1957, where substantial increases were made, the Congress allowed for the employment of 30,994. There is a difference there of 2,953 employees which the Department has been unable to employ. Yet this bill, in addition to the 2,953 that have been authorized but have not been hired, raises the employment another 1,086 employees.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right and mainly because the new programs that you and I, or the majority of us, voted for a year ago did not get started until just a few months before the 28th of February. They are still recruiting personnel to man these jobs that have been given to them by the Congress of the United States and by your President and mine. In some of these areas we were critical in our report because they have moved so slowly. We think they should have moved faster in many areas. One of the difficulties they have, of course, especially in the Office of Education, is the matter of salaries. It is difficult to attract good men at the salaries that the Government offers in some of these specialized fields, especially in the fields of science, medicine, and education. That is one of the things that has been holding them up, but we expect by June 30 with the amount that we authorized for 1957 they will have on the rolls at that time the full number authorized; so the actual increase for 1958 will be just what this table shows, 1,086.

Mr. BUDGE. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island would inform the committee as to the number of job increases in these two departments which were included in the 1957 appropriations over 1956?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not have those figures before me but I will get them for the gentleman in just a few minutes. In 9 times out of 10 these increases are due to the action we took as Members of Con-

gress when we passed additional legislation. Let us not forget that. When I voted for the social-security amendments last year I voted for them with the full knowledge it was going to cost a lot more money. I knew that at the time. There is no reason in the world for any of us to say, "I did not realize it was going to cost this amount of money when we voted these authorizations."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman speaking of administrative costs with respect to social security?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am talking about the increased Federal matching provisions for public assistance, the liberalizing amendments as far as disability, children, reducing the retirement age for women, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the social-security program a self-supporting program?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is supposed to be, but it is all paid from taxes of one kind or another. We are taking in about \$7½ billion a year and paying out \$7 billion in social-security benefits at this time.

Now, if I may run down through some of the programs in the Department of Labor. We have been a little bit critical of the Department of Labor for not doing more regarding the matter of the employment of older workers in this country. As many of you know, when a person reaches the age of 45 he often finds it impossible to get another job. We have spent nearly two hundred thousand dollars doing research in this field in the last two years. Now the Department of Labor has come up with a set of pamphlets that they think will help in inducing employers to hire men over the age of 45. We did not think the Department of Labor had gone far enough in this field. In our report this year we said:

The committee hopes that the so-called action programs planned for next year will speed up progress in this field.

That is one program, I am sure, that the Secretary of Labor could spend much more money in if he had it available to him, and it would do a world of good for the older people we are always talking about.

In the Office of the Secretary, while we cut the request \$109,000, we allowed \$50,000 for a non-recurring rent item; an increase of \$30,000 for international labor affairs, and approximately \$80,000 for other activities in the Office of the Secretary that go along with these increased programs we have enacted into law.

In the Solicitor's office there is a minimum increase of about \$20,000.

In the Bureau of Labor Standards we cut their request about in half.

In the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights, they come in with a sizable increase of about \$159,000, and we gave them the entire amount that they asked for, because that is the only agency in the Government today where the veteran has any special rights, and where any man going into the service today will

have his job guaranteed to him when he returns home. Because of the expanded Ready Reserve program, which will add very considerably to their work, we have allowed the full amount of increase of \$159,000. I believe that this increase is fully justified and I cannot imagine any Member of this body failing to support this item. To do so, in my opinion, would be to renege on the responsibility which we have to the veterans of this country.

In the Bureau of Apprentice there was a new item requested, which caused some concern among the Members of the Congress because there is some controversy between the vocational-education people and apprenticeship and training advocates. So we took off the "and training" part and eliminated \$340,000 that this new program would cost and kept it at the same level as 1957. We said in our report that we do not find fault with the program, but because of the confusion that exists on a local level in the States between the vocational people and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, we have deferred this item. If they straighten out their differences and the item is included by the Senate, we will then consider it in conference.

In the Bureau of Employment Security, we have allowed a small increase.

In the Bureau of Employees Compensation, we allowed a sizable increase to decentralize the work of the Bureau. As a result of 4 years' experience with one field office at San Francisco we found that it works very well. Processing claims has been speeded up, and the people who have been injured are getting better service and do not have to wait so long for benefits. So we have adopted their recommendation of establishing field offices in Boston, New York, and Chicago to further decentralize.

In the Bureau of Labor Statistics we cut the requested increase about in half.

In the Women's Bureau they asked for a little increase to hire four more people, and we have allowed for that.

In the Wage and Hour Division we have allowed what they asked for, which is not any increase in personnel.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have continued the programs at about the same level except for programs where there has been an expansion required by basic legislation voted by Congress.

Under the last Democratic administration this committee made recommendations that went over the President's budget for many programs, especially the National Institutes of Health, and the Congress approved it and the administration adopted these expanded programs because they felt that the majority of Congress wanted them adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is my understanding, from what the gentleman is saying, that having authorized all these activities, now we have to pay for them.

Mr. FOGARTY. Either pay for them or break faith with the States, commu-

nities, and institutions, and the people, that are acting and have put up money to meet their share of the cost of these programs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, what about some where we have no made any agreement with the States. There are some, are there not? There are such items in here.

Mr. FOGARTY. No. If there are, I do not know of any.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do the States have a part in everything carried in this bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. The law allows them to take part if, by an act of their own legislature, they put up matching funds required to take part in these grant programs. If a State decides not to, for instance, if the legislature in the State of Michigan decides not to take part in the new library service program, they do not have to take part and will not have to put up any money and any Federal money earmarked for Michigan will revert to the Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But we are in a position, then, that if the States do go along, by our previous action we have committed ourselves to a program that is going to cost more money.

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And there is no use talking about cutting the budget, is there?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know how you can cut some of those items. When you pass a bill that provides Federal assistance to federally impacted school areas, for instance, and establish a formula for entitlements, I do not know what can be done except to appropriate the money. If they meet that formula we have no alternative than to grant the amount of funds that the formula calls for. Of course, you can do one other thing; you can repeal some of the legislation that has been enacted if you want to reduce Government expenditures.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the gentleman to say, if we did that, we would be breaking faith with the States which decided to go along.

Mr. FOGARTY. Not by repealing the legislation, because we would give them due notice when the legislation was repealed. I am not recommending that, because I do not think some of these programs go far enough, but that is the way to do it if you want to cut expenditures.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman mean by not having gone far enough?

Mr. FOGARTY. In some of these areas I think they ought to be given more money than they are asking for if they are to do the job we expect of them. I do not think they have asked for enough in many areas. I think we could save the Federal Government money in the long run if we gave them more money to operate with in many instances.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. With reference to the activity having to do with the health of the Indians, I note that Dr. Shaw who is the head of this program and also was when it was in the Department of the Interior—I suppose he was on loan, by

the way—in his testimony was very critical of the Department of the Interior. I note also that the increase from 1953 in that particular activity has been from \$21 million to \$40 million. What additional facilities is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now supplying to the Indians that the Indian Bureau was not supplying at the time they took it over?

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me say first that the Public Health Service did not ask for this additional responsibility.

Mr. HALEY. I realize that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whose idea it was, but it is something they did not ask for. Knowing the Public Health Service as we do, and knowing it to be a good Service, when they assumed that responsibility we said, "As long as you have this responsibility now we want you to go in, make a survey, then come back and tell us exactly what is needed. We are going to give you the money to do a good job because we have received complaints that not much was being done to improve the health of the Indians on these reservations."

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield further.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it is the thought of the Health, Education, and Welfare people to extend these services to Indians off reservations. If so, I think they would get into deep water and instead of a program costing \$40 million a year, it will become a \$400 million program. Would the gentleman care to enlighten me on that?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot give the gentleman a good answer to that because I do not know for sure what they are thinking about, but they have presented no program to the committee regarding services for Indians not on reservations.

Mr. HALEY. That is what is worrying me, because if it is the intention of the Federal Government through the Health, Education and Welfare Department to go into that field, it is picking up a health problem that should belong to the State.

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as I know, that is not the intention, and I agree with the gentleman that the program should not be so expanded.

Mr. HALEY. I hope the gentleman does not misunderstand me. I am not opposed to providing them with good services on the reservations, but I would certainly like to know where the program is going.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it is a good question, and I think we are in agreement on this subject. As far as I do know, that is not the intention of the Public Health Service. As far as the committee is concerned, since the Public Health Service is charged with this responsibility we want to give them the tools with which to do a decent job.

We found they wanted to build 2 or 3 hospitals in the Southwest, in New Mexico and Arizona, but the administration has said those hospitals are not going to be built until they get inflation under control. We think they ought to be built.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. As a member of the subcommittee which heard the testimony on this appropriation bill, I want to express my appreciation of the manner in which the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] conducted those hearings. He had a detailed knowledge of all the affairs of the departments that came before this committee. He was painstaking; he was patient. I felt that he was anxious to cut out waste, inefficiency and extravagance wherever possible, and at the same time to avoid impairing the essential functions of government.

A really outstanding work of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been his effort in behalf of retarded children. They had been forgotten and nothing was being done for them. Then our chairman undertook a program. He inaugurated a program of education and of research in the neurological division of the National Institutes of Health. Now a real program has been worked out for the fuller development of retarded children.

The work of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in behalf of public health and medical research already is legend. It will be remembered after many of us are long gone.

I am sorry we did not go as far in this bill as I think we should have gone in some respects. Because of the research work of the National Institutes of Health, blindness has been reduced 40 percent. I am sorry that we did not do something to promote more research into hearing disorders and deafness. I wish a \$1 million sum had been recommended for that purpose.

We do not know just how many people there are who suffer from deafness and hearing difficulties. But we know there are a great many. Almost nothing has been done in the way of research on this subject. We did transfer I think about \$600,000 to be used for that purpose.

Another thing I am sorry we did not go ahead with is the chemotherapy program in search of a possible cancer cure there. There will be 5 or 6 million dollars of cancer-research funds left over at the end of this fiscal year. The Public Health Service had made arrangements with the pharmaceutical companies to carry out research in the use of drugs for treating cancer. I think this program was really getting somewhere. But the National Institutes of Health were unable to get approval from higher authorities for the form of contracts to be used for this work. These left-over funds will now revert to the Treasury. I wish we could have reapportioned this money for that program instead of permitting it to revert.

Again I want to express my appreciation to the chairman for the manner in which he has conducted these hearings.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

I should like now to proceed with my statement. We did find criticism of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with regard to their program on

problems of the aging. That is a problem that is coming upon us and not enough is being done about it. We have been critical of the lack of enthusiasm for developing a program now for some years. I remember when Oscar Ewing was the Administrator we criticized him for not doing more in this field, and we have more critical comment regarding the present administration.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. In just a moment. I would like to finish this statement.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am going to make a point of order, then.

Mr. FOGARTY. Go ahead and make it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana when I complete my statement. But I insist that no man will succeed in getting me to yield this floor through the use of threats. I never have succumbed to a threatening statement and I hope I never will.

Mr. Chairman, in the construction program we found some criticism too, because we believe that some of the proposed construction could save the Federal Government a lot of money. We have been attempting to get a new building for the old-age and survivors' insurance program in Baltimore now for years. That building, they tell us, will save a million dollars a year. As long as the construction of that building is held up, it will cost the fund \$1 million a year. We have been trying to get a building for the Communicable Disease Center built in Atlanta, Ga., that would house different components of this agency under one roof, which would save the Federal Government money. But, because the administration chose to get it under this lease-purchase idea, that building has not been started. We thought last year we made provisions to build a dental research building at Bethesda, but because of the policy of the administration, funds for that building have been deleted. We gave approval a year ago to build an administration building for the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, but because of the same policy, that building has been deferred and they have forced the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to go out and hire space that they so badly need at this time. We think the building program has been very poorly handled, indeed.

With reference to the Food and Drug Administration, we gave them just what they asked for—not as much as the Citizens Advisory Committee recommended a couple of years ago, but we gave them everything they asked for.

With reference to Gallaudet Hospital, we are living up to the agreement with Gallaudet College making that college of first-class rank.

Howard University has been given a little cut. They asked for \$800,000 more

this year for salaries and expenses and we allowed them \$500,000, which we thought was a fair increase. We also are giving them something that they have been requesting for 4 or 5 years now—\$150,000 to plan 2 new buildings.

In the Office of Education, we allowed the full amount for vocational education except for Guam and the new fisheries program. The only place in the budget that we went over the Bureau of the Budget figures was on the grants for library services. The Department asked the Bureau of the Budget for \$5 million for library services. The Bureau of the Budget allowed \$3 million and this committee is recommending \$5 million. The authorization approved by this House and signed by the President is \$7,500,000.

On the payments to school districts and assistance on school construction in federally impacted areas, we gave just what they asked for.

On salaries and expenses, we cut them in the Department of Education \$500,000. We asked the Department of Education to come up with a program next year that will help in better educational opportunities for the 1,500,000 or 2 million children who have speech or hearing defects.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the report on page 17, on the construction of Indian health facilities, I find this language:

Available for construction of Indian health facilities during the fiscal year 1956, \$5,535,000.

What Indian health facilities does that refer to?

Mr. FOGARTY. Where is that in the report?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On page 17 of the report, the second line, "available for construction of Indian health facilities during the fiscal year, 1956."

I am wondering what the Indian health facilities are that are referred to.

Mr. FOGARTY. They are dwellings to accommodate some of the public health personnel who are working with the Indians, small clinic buildings and that sort of thing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does that deal with sanitary facilities, waterworks, and so forth?

Mr. FOGARTY. No not sanitary facilities.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there some appropriation here for sanitary facilities, such as sewage disposal plants, and water plants of some kind?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. There is nothing in here for that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They have been before a subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] is chairman, asking for an authorization to construct and maintain sewage disposal plants.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is nothing in this bill for that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman mentioned grants for library

service. On what basis does the committee justify going above the budget figure? I ask that particularly in view of the fact that recently the House passed a resolution calling upon the President to tell us where we could cut the budget further because the budget was too high. In this instance we are going over what the President recommended.

Mr. FOGARTY. We increased that item because the Congress last year overwhelmingly voted for this library service bill. We laid down a certain formula for providing Federal funds that the States could match, by enacting legislation in their own States. We were told that some thirty-odd States had taken action, and that by next fiscal year the States will have put up enough money to use \$6 million instead of \$5 million.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As I understood the bill that was passed last year—I was against it, but it was passed, as the gentleman said, overwhelmingly—but as I recall we provided for about \$7 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. \$7,500,000.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Now you are saying that if all of the States do everything that it is possible for them to do, it is anticipated they will match about \$6 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. Six million, on the basis of current estimates.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yet you are going to give them only \$5 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me tell the gentleman—

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Why do we pick out that place to make a reduction of \$1 million?

Mr. FOGARTY. The authorization is \$7,500,000. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare asked the Bureau of the Budget for \$5 million. Some of us were trying to get this raised in committee. We tried to get \$6 million. Five million dollars was a compromise in the committee between the \$6 million and the \$3 million requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. How does the Bureau of the Budget justify \$3 million?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot tell you. The Bureau of the Budget has confused me on many occasions. I just cannot answer you.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Did anybody attempt to justify the \$3 million figure?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. The Office of Education witnesses. They had no other choice but to justify what was in the budget, because they are under those restrictions.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. I commend the committee and its chairman, Representative FOGARTY, for making the library appropriation the only item that was raised above the budget and upon providing these additional funds. As a result of our authorization bill last year some States enacted legislation to take advantage of this Federal assistance. My State was one of them. In a way it was

our moral obligation after the States had passed laws to avail themselves of the Federal law. I express my appreciation to the committee and hope the House will support the committee figure for libraries.

Mr. FOGARTY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. When I rose a little while ago I had in mind asking the gentleman for a little information. The matter I have in mind is not a vital matter, but it is something that I would like to have the gentleman clear up. That is this item of salaries and expenses in the Public Health Service, where you have increased it by \$69,000.

Why have salaries been increased when salaries generally are reduced? That is, the salary account generally in the bill has been reduced. Why do you increase that \$69,000?

Mr. FOGARTY. Which appropriation?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. On page 37 of the report.

Mr. FOGARTY. Salaries and expenses for hospital construction services, is that what the gentleman is referring to? That is just for increases in mandatory costs.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is mandatory increases only?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that they should have more personnel in that division to do a better job in connection with this hospital construction program. As the gentleman knows, his State has been one of the States that has taken full advantage of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act. In order to keep it going in the right way we have to have good administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am interested in keeping down expenditures where we can keep them down properly. The gentleman said that is a mandatory increase?

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no increase for personnel. It is a mandatory increase.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why was the request for \$2½ million disallowed?

Mr. FOGARTY. It was disallowed on the basis that it was a new program that added to Federal expenditures. Even though it was authorized by the Congress last year in the social security amendments, it was a new program and that was one of the areas that had less appeal than some of the others.

Mr. COOLEY. A program as comprehensive as this and a program involving this much money to be spent should have trained personnel to be used in the administration of the program?

Mr. FOGARTY. I happen to agree with the gentleman, but the majority did not agree with us. As a result we have that \$2½ million cut.

Mr. COOLEY. I regret that the committee did not authorize that amount.

Mr. FOGARTY. I have taken more time than I expected so I will just briefly mention the remaining items in the bill.

In connection with vocational rehabilitation we have allowed the full amount requested. In salaries and expenses we cut \$115,000 and provided that all of the increase be utilized in the field offices.

In connection with the Public Health Service, the appropriation recommended for "Assistance to States, general" is a reduction of \$5 million from the request, but is an increase of \$2 million over 1957.

The amounts recommended for grants to Alaska, venereal disease control and tuberculosis, are the same as the requests. For communicable disease control we cut \$60,000.

For "sanitary engineering activities" we cut \$423,000 from their request and allowed an increase of \$3,640,000 over 1957. The increase is made necessary by the new legislation of the last Congress.

Grants for waste treatment works construction is \$50 million, the same as last year.

The hospital construction program in total is what they asked for.

For United States Public Health Service hospitals and medical care we show an increase because of the deplorable condition that exists in those hospitals at this time. We feel that patients should get first class attention in these hospitals.

Indian health activities have been discussed earlier.

Now, referring to the National Institutes of Health. We made one change in their request this year. The Department asked for funds to increase allowance to the universities and institutions receiving research grants from 15 to 25 percent. We have denied that increase from 15 to 25 percent on the basis that it was only 2 years ago that we raised that allowance from 8 to 15 percent. We did not reduce the amount of money requested for this, which was \$6 million plus, and have made this amount available to the National Institutes of Health for further research above what was budgeted for. We did earmark the amount that would have been used for increased overhead allowances in the field of cancer, or \$1,616,000, to enter into contracts with pharmaceutical houses to test the thousands of chemical compounds they have lying on the shelves for anticancer properties.

In the field of neurology, \$620,000 was budgeted for increased overhead allowances. We have earmarked that to be expended in a program of research into the problem of children with hearing and speech defects. Those are the two main changes as far as the Institutes of Health are concerned. And, incidentally, I had expected to speak in much more detail on this today but I have yielded to Members rather freely and am running out of time so I shall mention more about this important program for speech and hearing defects tomorrow.

St. Elizabeths Hospital—we cut out all of the increase in personnel that they

asked for but allowed in full for all mandatory increases.

We gave the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance practically what they asked for.

We reduced the figure of \$1,679,000,000 for public assistance grants to \$1,600,000,000 for reasons set forth in the report. If the actual requirements are more than we have allowed, then under the law we have to meet them, unless you change the law.

We have reduced the salaries and expenses for the Children's Bureau by \$154,000, and have given them what they asked for in grants to States.

In the Office of the Secretary, he asked for a sizable increase, and we gave about half of what was requested.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know there are others who want to speak on the bill. I have yielded to everybody who has asked me to yield and as a result have taken quite a bit of time, but I want to make one closing remark. I think you will agree with me that when we are dealing with human beings as we are in this particular bill, it is a most difficult one to cut. I am not satisfied with it, and the reason I am not satisfied with it is because I do not think we go far enough in some of these fields. I think we could expend more money in research on many of these diseases that are killing and disabling human beings than we are spending. We could save lives, and we could save money by an expenditure of more funds than we are providing. But, it is the best we could do under the circumstances. I am very happy to present this report to you, and I ask for your earnest consideration and support of it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Preliminary to my remarks on the bill now before us, it is my desire to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and his committee on the splendid bill they have brought before us with particular reference to the subject of health.

I have observed during the 11 years that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been a member of this important subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee and for the 7 years during which he has been chairman, that he has at all times exhibited a very great and commendable interest in providing adequate funds to advance the health activities of our Government. There has been at no time anyone in the Congress whose humane instincts have done more to promote the welfare of our people than the gentleman from Rhode Island who has just addressed us. Whenever his membership in this House may cease, and I certainly hope, as do the rest of his colleagues, that it will be a long, long time in the future, that it will be with the full measure of satisfaction that comes to one who has worked sincerely, honestly, and well in behalf of his fellow man. He has justly earned the good will of his colleagues and the thousands upon thousands of people to whom his labors have already and will hereafter benefit. His work merits the praise

of all. I trust we in this House, the people whom he so ably represents in his congressional district, and the people of this Nation as a whole shall continue to have the benefit of his great service to humanity.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], as chairman of his great committee, has presented a clear and lucid picture of the health needs of our Nation, what has been accomplished, and what is planned for the future. A reading of the testimony given at the numerous hearings held by the committee, and the questions and comments of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], leaves no doubt that Chairman FOGARTY is the best informed man in Congress on all the details affecting our national health program. His knowledge of the entire subject is great. It is indeed remarkable. But of equal importance with his knowledge is the fact that his heart has human instincts that speak out for a recognition by the Government of its obligation to provide adequately for the health of our people.

The bill as presented by the committee is entitled to the support of the Congress. It recognizes the need for care in making expenditures, but it also recognizes there are some considerations that must take precedence over the mere saving of dollars and cents. We must be equally, or, even more concerned in preserving the health of our people and saving the lives of our people. This is the purpose and intent of the appropriations contained in this bill in providing research, preventive, and other type programs and facilities for the sick and mentally and physically handicapped who are in our midst.

I am in entire accord with the thought already expressed that there is no subject more difficult to cut than appropriations made to promote health and care for the sick and handicapped. And yet, the committee has been able to make some reduction in the overall budget estimates without seriously impairing the necessary services. It is true that there may be additional ways in which money can and should be spent to advantage, yet it is also true that many such can await a little longer until the need for reducing costs of government is not so impelling as at the present time. This bill, therefore, shows a fine sense of responsibility to provide what is necessary but withhold what can be deferred without doing immediate harm.

My service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has afforded me the opportunity to take part in the building up of our national health program. I confess, and in all sincerity frankly state, there has been no service in my many years in Congress that has given me more genuine and real pleasure and satisfaction than that which I have been able to do as a member and chairman, at times, of the above-mentioned committee in the field of health legislation.

This program to promote health has extended into numerous and varied fields of activity. When I first became a member of the committee nearly 30 years ago

there was little being done on the Federal level as compared to the present to provide nationwide programs to promote health and encourage research. Increased interest has caused not only the adoption of Federal programs but also an increase in the number and expanse of State and local programs. All of this latter expansion has been largely the result of legislation that has authorized and provided Federal funds to State and local authorities to assist and thereby encourage them to inaugurate new or more extensive health programs and to provide additional facilities for the better care of the sick and handicapped.

Thus, programs have been instituted for the benefit of mentally retarded children, care of the aging, construction of hospitals, nursing homes, clinical health centers, rehabilitation facilities, assistance to the blind, mentally ill, prevention and elimination of venereal diseases, research programs related to prevention and cure of tuberculosis, cancer, heart disease, arthritis, polio, blindness, communicable and infectious diseases, dental health activities, neurology, health research facilities. This represents merely a quick summary of what has been done and is being done through Federal activity. There is much more that could be said if time permitted the whole story to be told. A reading of the committee hearings would undoubtedly be a surprise and I believe would convince anyone who may doubt the efficacy and widespread good being accomplished in the field of public health.

I trust that the membership will give full consideration to the fine work being done in this important field of government activity and the splendid results being attained. I venture to say that there are no Government expenditures that are producing more satisfactory results. And, in my opinion, our obligation to promote and improve the health of our people is one that cannot and should not be ignored. Let whatever cuts in expenditures may be necessary be made where the health, happiness, and lives of our people will not be imperiled or curtailed.

I appeal to the membership to support the pending bill in its entirety.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this opportunity to announce that the distinguished Lord Mayor of Dublin, Ireland, the Honorable Robert Briscoe, will be here this afternoon between 3 and 3:15, and that the membership of the House will have an opportunity to greet him in the Speaker's rooms at that time.

I thank the gentleman from New York. Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the bill comes here with the endorsement of the Committee on Appropriations. Frankly, I feel that we have not met the situation that we are faced with.

Now, just so you can have a little picture of what we are facing, I want to call your attention to a few figures that I took out of the Treasury statement yesterday relating to the financial situation of the United States.

On the 31st of December we showed an increase in receipts of \$3,350 million over the same 6 months of fiscal 1956. We showed an increase in expenditures of \$2,155 million. So that in the first 6 months of this fiscal year we were better off in the matter of balancing the budget than we were before by \$1,195 million.

At the present time—probably I am a day or two out of the way, but these are the latest figures I was able to get—the expenditures above last year had risen from \$2,155 million to \$5,682 million, and the receipts had risen at that time above last year only to \$4,283 million. That means that instead of being better off, as we were the 1st day of January, we are worse off toward a balanced budget today by \$1,399 million. That means that our position has changed by the sum of those 2 figures, or \$2,594 million as of this date. In other words, we are \$2½ billion in worse shape toward balancing the budget for this particular year than we were on the 1st day of January.

I do not know how that impresses the membership. I appreciate that a fellow who tells a story that brings out the facts, even though it hurts, and hurts his own feelings to give them, does not get the most attentive audience in the world. But I want to say that those figures, to my mind, demand of every Member of the House of Representatives the utmost of vigilance in trying to screen out every dollar of appropriations and expenditures that it is possible to screen out. And we will have to do that on some things that we ourselves would like to see built up; because the worst thing that can happen to the United States, the worst thing that we can have happen to us is to come into the end of this fiscal year without a balanced budget. That means more and more inflation; that means more and more difficulty in trying to get anywhere with the situation that we are confronted with.

This bill has come before you with the Appropriations Committee divided. Frankly, I felt that it could be cut quite considerably without hurting anything. I thought it would be very much better if we did not try to advance so rapidly in our expenditures that we would perhaps upset the applecart entirely.

The bill does come here with a cut in the budget estimates of \$118,774,700, with a total budget estimate of \$2,862,000,000. As compared with last year it is less. It is less because the authorized amount for school construction was \$66 million less than was appropriated last year, and because the veterans' unemployment insurance is running out. It amounts to \$33 million less than it did in the bill for 1957.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Are not some of the cuts less than firm cuts, certainly in the field of grants to the States? Are they not

in the nature of estimates on the part of the committee instead of firm cuts that will stand up?

Mr. TABER. I would not want to say that. I am inclined to believe that most of the cuts are pretty well stable. The social security grants have been cut quite considerably, that is, \$79,400,000 on the grant estimate, and there are a few smaller cuts on different items.

The picture there, in my opinion, and I think I am correct, is that they have a pretty bad situation with reference to the management of the biggest block of money in this bill. Out of the \$1.6 billion of appropriations, the limitation in the bill calls for not exceeding \$104 million for administration. This means that the total amount for administration will be 15 percent, or a little better, of the amount that is given away. That is a very bad situation. There is State after State where the amount is much more than 15 percent. The worst part of the picture to me is that in my own State the average expenditures are 20 percent of the amount that is allocated to the people who operate it by the Federal Government and the States. The figure for the administration, or the part of it that relates to dependent children is as high as 27 percent. In other words, of every dollar you give them 27 cents goes for administration. That, to me, is tragic. It means that the people in the States who are handling this thing have not gotten on top of it and they are not getting on top of it. For that reason, I am very much disturbed about it.

There are many items in this bill which, in my opinion, should be reduced further. I am not going to go into the details of them at this time. I hope when these items are reached that those Members interested in economy will offer amendments to reduce the bill so that it will carry no more than is absolutely required to do a decent job. The committee has done something toward reducing the number of personnel involved, but, in my opinion, I believe in a great many cases we could have done a great deal more and at least brought them back to the current year's figures. The whole situation here, to me, is one where, if we do not meet our responsibilities and face the situation, it is going to be very difficult for us to do any kind of a job with the Government's money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in the hearings it is proposed by the Department of Labor that employees transferred or decentralized and moved to another part of the country be paid \$12-a-day plus \$6-a-day for dependents, which would be in addition to transportation and moving of their household effects. That would be setting a new precedent and an expensive one. Can the gentleman tell us whether that got into the bill?

Mr. TABER. As I remember it, that was included in the budget estimate, but, frankly, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any such authorization as that in the present bill? I have not been able to find it. But,

some of the language here is not too clear to me.

Mr. TABER. I cannot tell the gentleman offhand whether that is in the bill or not.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I can advise the gentleman from Iowa that that was deleted by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Well, that is where they did one thing toward improving the bill. Mr. Chairman, I hope that when this bill is finished that we will have gone on record in favor of improving the bill a little bit more. The committee did some improving, but I would like to see the House stand for improving the bill a little bit more.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Did I understand the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] to say that there was something in this bill that he could not find; if that is true, why, then, this is the first bill he has slipped on.

Mr. TABER. It must be that he was looking at the budget which was sent down here rather than the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In this bill, there are a number of new Federal grant-in-aid programs that are just being inaugurated. I refer particularly to this one for the library services. That has not been done before; has it?

Mr. TABER. It was authorized a year ago, and the other body inserted some money in the bill to operate it; \$2,050,000 was provided. Down through the 1st day of February, as I remember it, about \$400,000 of that \$2,050,000 had been obligated. How much they will have obligated at the end of the year I do not know. Frankly, I want to say to the gentleman that I am opposed to any increase above the budget because so many States have not approved of it, and some of them have definitely refused.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There is one thing that bothers me. Perhaps the gentleman can clear it up. When the Congress authorizes, let us use as an example this library-service program, an expenditure of \$7½ million, does that give to the Department authority to obligate up to that \$7½ million even before the Congress has appropriated \$7½ million or whatever money is carried in the appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. It does not. They have no authority to obligate any money until they get specific legislation to obligate.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Then I would assume that the status of this matter, as far as the next fiscal year is concerned, is that there is no actual obligation, other than the statement of congressional intent, that it is desired to move into this program to some degree.

Mr. TABER. There may be a few odds and ends, tails to the kite, like small items that have been obligated that have

to be paid for before the 1st of July, but that is all.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORGARTY] places a great deal of stress upon the fact that in most cases the Appropriations Committee was tied because of the authorization policy. I wondered if the gentleman agrees that your hands were tied to the extent that the gentleman from Rhode Island would have us believe.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know. I did not hear just what he said along that line, but as far as I am concerned, my hands are not tied on appropriating any money unless we have previously given them, by statute or otherwise, contract authority, and we may have to meet that contract authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this bill that is before us today is perhaps one of the most difficult appropriation bills upon which to operate, as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned. If we on the Appropriations Committee have erred at all in the markup of this appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, we have erred on the side of generosity. It is a fact that the Congress was overgenerous in appropriating funds in this bill last year. As a matter of fact over \$20 million will be returned to the Treasury which was appropriated last year. I am sure every effort was made by the various bureaus to spend this money.

This Congress has expressed disapproval of the President's budget in many speeches. Most of the talking has been in broad general terms and not in specific terms as it relates to individual budget items. Today we will be face to face with specific budget items. The Congress expressed the opinion just 4 weeks ago that the Executive budget was too high. The majority party supported this resolution on a straight party vote.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished and able subcommittee chairman has gone into detail on each of the individual items of this appropriation bill. It might be well for us to look at a few of the overall figures in this bill.

The Department of Labor receives an appropriation of \$364,366,300 in this bill. That is the direct appropriation and does not include funds which are transferred from the various trust funds. This compares with a budget request made for the Department of Labor in the amount of \$384,678,000, or a reduction of \$20 million in the request placed before the committee by the Department and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The total appropriation for the Department of Labor in this present fiscal year is \$380,785,000; therefore, the appropriation in this bill is \$16,419,000 below the appropriation authorized for this fiscal year.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the budget estimate for this fiscal year which was presented

to our committee was \$2,582,000,000. This bill contains an appropriation in direct funds from the Treasury of \$2,483,000,000. I think it is well for us to look closely at this particular bill to see where the major reductions, when compared to the 1957 budget, are shown. These major reductions are in the amount of \$33.2 million for payments of unemployment compensation for veterans. This was a nonrecurring expense that would not normally appear in this appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1958. There is no real budget cut either on the part of the Bureau of the Budget or on the part of the Appropriations Committee as far as this \$33.2 million reduction is concerned.

The next big item is the \$66.8 million reduction in assistance to school districts for school construction. This also was a nonrecurring item of expense and does not represent a budget reduction as far as the Bureau of the Budget is concerned or as far as the House Appropriations Committee is concerned. In addition to that, there is a reduction as compared with the 1957 budget of \$5.6 million in the construction of Indian health facilities. Also in this bill there is the figure of \$6.8 million which does not recur from last year's budget covering the appropriation for construction of hospital facilities at St. Elizabeths. These and similar nonrecurring items make up a total of \$120 million. In other words, the budget base for fiscal year 1957 can be reduced by this amount in comparison with the 1958 figures, in the bill before us today.

I think it is well for us to look over some of the new programs which the President and the Bureau included in this particular bill. Every one of these new programs was authorized by the 84th Congress. I might add that I voted with the minority on the establishment of these programs.

During the testimony which you will find in the committee hearings I asked a question of the Social Security Administrator as to the total cost of the social-security bill passed by the last session of Congress. I asked what projected yearly cost of that program was, and I received the answer. That answer was \$1,800,000,000 a year.

Many people, when they voted on this particular bill, thought they were approving a bill providing for the reduction of the age level for retirement for women from 65 to 62 and for a new total disability program starting at the age of 50.

This particular bill contained many other provisions which were far-reaching and received very little attention when the bill was acted upon. This legislation last year provided for a new authorization and new program of \$5 million for each of the first 2 years and an open-end authorized thereafter to take over the State and local responsibility of training State and local welfare workers. The Federal Government would pay 80 percent of that cost of this training. Also in that bill were provisions which changed the Federal-State matching formula, which increased the amount the Federal Government's grant, on old-age assistance, to take but one

example, from \$30 to \$39, an increase of \$9 per month. This in effect almost unloaded total cost of this program on Federal Government in several low-budget States. All of these State-Federal grant matching formulas were changed in this particular bill, and those changes alone brought about the increase in this bill of over \$200 million in the single item of public assistance grants to States.

The budget request for grants to States for public assistance was \$1,670,000,000, and it seems to me when the committee shows a cut in this program of \$79 million, we are merely fooling ourselves. This cut will not stand up if the States show that they have expended the money in a larger amount than our committee has estimated. And, it is our guess against the guess of the Social Security Administrator, and whether that particular cut will actually be a cut depends entirely on the program in each of the 48 States. We may only be faced with a supplemental next January.

Today all of us have received wires from public welfare people and State public welfare directors objecting to the administrative expense limitation which was written into this particular bill. This limitation provides that no more than \$104 million can be used for administrative expense reimbursement. I feel that the limitation is a justifiable limitation and certainly if any Member will take the time to read over the record on this particular item in our bill and see how these State administrative expenses have gone up, I am sure you will agree that some definite limitation is necessary and proper. We find that the administrative costs in some States are running to as high as 17 percent of the total money paid out to individual recipients in a program. In other States the administrative cost is down below 4 percent of the total amount paid out in grants. It is time that some pruning of these administrative costs be brought about as far as the Federal Government's matching is concerned.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Can the gentleman tell the committee offhand how much the States pay in the way of matching for those costs?

Mr. LAIRD. Well, the States and local communities pay 50 percent of the total cost of the salaries and expenses.

Mr. JONAS. So that this full sum, as limited by this action, can be used, and amounting to only 50 percent, the administrative costs would be over \$200 million.

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. The matching formula is a 50-50 formula with no limitation at the present time as to the total over all amount that will be matched. We wrote a limitation into the supplemental appropriation bill for this particular fiscal year. That limitation was \$101 million, and it was sustained here in the House for this particular fiscal year. This is a limitation for fiscal 1958, and it is an increase over

the previously authorized limitation approved by the House of \$3 million.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I want to commend the committee on the cuts that it has made, and I would like to ask one question. Hurriedly glancing over the table on the back of the committee report, it indicates that while many cuts have been made over the proposed budget this year, it still indicates that it has not been reduced very much over the 1957 appropriation. Let me ask the gentleman this question: It seems that the salaries and expenses account for a great deal of the increase. Is that due to the fact that they have added personnel or increased their salaries?

Mr. LAIRD. As far as the salaries and expenses item throughout the entire bill is concerned, the large portion of increase is due to the provision for extra days pay and civil-service retirement.

The greatest personnel increase is in the Social Security Administration. Of course, that is not paid by direct appropriations from the Treasury but by appropriations from the social security trust fund.

Mr. BEAMER. Is it true that many of these agencies have been adding to their personnel.

Mr. LAIRD. That is certainly true.

Mr. BEAMER. I do not find it in the committee hearings; I have not had a chance to study them very carefully.

Mr. LAIRD. If you take one specific example, the Wage and Hour Division, the gentleman will find a tremendous increase in personnel over the budget request for 1957. However, there was a supplemental request that was submitted after passing of the minimum bill last year. This bill, you will remember, increased the minimum wage from 75 cents to a dollar.

Mr. BEAMER. Did that increase the number of people required?

Mr. LAIRD. Personnel as far as investigators were almost double in this Wage and Hour Division. Employment went to a total figure of 1,535 authorized positions in a division that had less than 1,000 in the original 1957 budget.

In answer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] the current employment of the United States Department of Labor on February 28 was 5,160. The number of positions requested in the 1958 budget was 5,710. The number which the committee allowed is 5,553. This makes a total of 393 new positions allowed in this bill as compared with employment on February 28.

Mr. BEAMER. The committee cut back the number.

Mr. LAIRD. As to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, employment on February 28, 1957, was 28,041. The budget request for 1958 in number of positions was 33,105. The number of positions allowed in this bill is 32,080. The greatest single increase in that particular is in the item Salaries and Expenses in the Office of Field Administration and in the Social Security Administration.

Mr. BEAMER. I did not intend to pick out any specific agencies, but it seemed, looking over the table in back of the committee report, that the item Salaries and Expenses accounted for a considerable portion of the increase. I was merely asking if that was due to increased salaries or to an increase in number of positions.

Mr. LAIRD. There is an increase in the number of positions allowed in this bill over 1957 of 1,233 positions. There is also the provision concerning Civil Service retirement charges which affects the appropriation figure.

Mr. BEAMER. Is the increase in personnel due to legislation passed by the preceding Congress or is it due to an increase in the requests made by the agencies themselves?

Mr. LAIRD. The increases in position were justified before our committee as a direct result of legislative enactment by the 84th Congress and by the increased responsibilities which these departments insisted were brought about through this congressional action.

Mr. BEAMER. In other words, it is the result of action of the previous Congress; it is an inheritance, shall we say, and we cannot avoid it.

Mr. LAIRD. We could avoid it if we did not appropriate the money, if the House decided not to follow through on the position which the last Congress took. In that case the House would not have to appropriate the money. That is one way it can be stopped. The other would be for the House to repeal the authorizing legislation.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. On page 12 of the committee report, with reference to the Office of Education, I notice this statement:

However, the total man-years of employment provided for by the committee's recommendations will be considerably higher in 1958 than in 1957.

I wonder if the gentleman has any specific figures on the anticipated increase either in man-years or number of positions?

I have a second question in that same connection, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. For the Office of Education, the greatest increase in number of positions is shown as follows: The total employment in the Office of Education on February 28, 1957, was 660. The number allowed in the budget request for 1958 was 839. The number the committee allowed was 742. In the budget of 1957 the number of positions permitted was 751. The number of positions allowed in this particular budget for the Office of Education is 742, but as I said the budget request for 1958 was for 839 positions.

Mr. JOHANSEN. But that does mean an increase of about 82 over the February 28 statement.

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct, but I should like to point out to the gentleman

that the authorized strength of the Office of Education was higher, but there were unfilled vacancies in the Department of Education as of February 28, 1957.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Are there any additions covered in that 80 additional that are in any sense anticipatory of the possible adoption of Federal assistance to the States for school construction? Is there an anticipatory increase in the budget as to persons?

Mr. LAIRD. There was no positions allowed in anticipation of that bill. Of course, many of these people would work on that program if that bill should pass. The Office of Education will ask for more positions, you can rest assured of that, should the Federal construction aid bill pass.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I have no doubt on that score.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. For fear the House will get the impression that all of these increases in personnel are due to enactments of the 84th Congress, let us take, for example, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As of the end of February of this year they had 28,041 employees, yet clear back in the 1956 fiscal year appropriation bill they had authorization for 503 employees, which was 462 more employees under the authorization in the 1956 appropriation bill, and they still have to have additional employees. In 1957 they were allowed to go up to 34,994, and they still got up only to the 28,000 figure. This bill takes it up over 32,000, which is 4,000 people more than they actually had employed at the end of February of this year, even though clear back in the 1956 appropriation bill they could have had, were they able to employ them, 462 people more than they now have on the rolls.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman misunderstood my statement. I said that in their appearances before the committee the departments justified their increases on the basis of the increased workload that was brought about by congressional action. I think that if the gentleman will go through the record he will see that they did justify their requests for increased positions on that basis.

Mr. BUDGE. I am happy that the gentleman has clarified that, because I think the Members would have concluded that all of these additional employees that are called for in the bill result from actions of the last Congress, when from their own employment records I do not believe that is true, as the gentleman has pointed out.

Mr. LAIRD. According to the testimony before the committee the administrators of those agencies tried to justify their increases on the basis of the new legislation passed by the 84th Congress. That was what I was referring to in my comments earlier.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Reference was made earlier in the gentleman's discussion

about the grants-to-States and public assistance about the \$79,400,000, perhaps, not being a confirmed cut in the final analysis. Have you in this committee been in the habit of cutting these grants in the past, and, if so, will the gentleman state what the experience has been—whether our guess has been nearer right or has the department's guess been nearer right and what is the best prospect as to whether this \$79 million or a part of it will have to go back in a supplemental request.

Mr. LAIRD. I cannot tell the gentleman definitely whether the \$79 million will be a saving or not. I do not think it is possible to tell that at this time. This is the best guess the committee can make as to the amount of money that will be used. Actually, I do not think it is fair to say that this is definitely a saving so far as the expenditure of funds from the Treasury is concerned. The same thing is true on other programs like vocational rehabilitation. I think you will find they will be back here with a supplemental bill in the second session of the 85th Congress to make up any deficiency which may exist in the fourth quarter of 1958.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. This is not at all to belittle the work of the committee which has undoubtedly done a very thorough and exhaustive job; however, the report comes in showing a net saving of one-hundred-and-eighteen-million-odd dollars from the requests. As every Member of the House knows, the country wants a severe cut in this budget. I think everybody knows that. If this item which was just referred to of \$79,400,000 has to be restored, together with certain other items which may have to be restored, is it not possible that that \$118 million will be entirely wiped out?

Mr. LAIRD. That is quite possible if in the next few months, the State legislatures, particularly in some of the Southern States, raise the amounts allowed in their budgets for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and other programs.

Mr. HIESTAND. The point I am asking here is that this \$118 million total recommended decrease figures a shade over 2½ percent, which is nowhere near a substantial decrease from the committee's recommended budget. If that is entirely wiped out, we would be in a position of having to vote, if we take the committee's recommendation either for no increase or for an actual increase over the Federal Government's requested budget; is that not a fact?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. In my opening statement, I tried to point out the reason. Most of the reductions over the 1957 budget figures as compared to this 1958 budget bill were on nonrecurring expenses, and if you consider increase allowed in this bill for personnel and salaries which will be a recurring expense for the fiscal year 1959, you will find that we will have trouble next year with this bill.

Mr. HIESTAND. In effect, we may be called upon to approve an increase instead of a cut in the budget?

Mr. LAIRD. Not today, but we could. That is a possibility I have outlined before.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. On that same point, do you remember a year ago when we had some new grant items for unemployment compensation for veterans, the administration asked for \$90 million and we cut them \$20 million. We thought that was a sizable cut. But, we find they cannot use the \$70 million. So, we were a little too conservative in cutting that grant item.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman will agree that that does not necessarily represent a saving of expenditure of Federal tax dollars as the money would not have been used anyway.

Mr. FOGARTY. It would have reverted to the Treasury, the same as all these cuts. Then, on Federal employees, we cut them \$5 million on the basis that we did not think that many Government employees would be discharged from their jobs. That cut has stood up.

On this cut there is every reason to believe it will stand up. Of course, if we should get into a depression we may have to appropriate three times what this cut would be.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the \$104 million for administration of the assistance program, do I understand that you have granted what was asked for and put a limitation that they should not bring any more?

Mr. LAIRD. No. I think the gentleman will find that the record before our committee would indicate that the amount of money they estimate they will need for administrative expenses in fiscal year 1958 is \$104,500,000. We have set a limitation of \$104 million.

Mr. KEAN. Approximately the same amount?

Mr. LAIRD. Approximately the same amount. An increase over the limitation we enacted several weeks back, which was \$101 million for fiscal year 1957.

Mr. KEAN. But actually by doing this, whether it is correct or not, you are negating the law passed by the Ways and Means Committee and passed by the Congress saying that we would match the amounts that the States would spend.

Mr. LAIRD. I feel it is a perfectly proper limitation for an Appropriations Committee to exercise in the use of Federal funds. It is a limitation on the amount that can be used for matching administrative expenses, and I feel that some committee of the Congress has to keep check on these administrative expenses. It seems the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] tells us that he is disturbed by the proposition before us today. He is not the only one who is disturbed. There are many people who are disturbed by this budget.

The fiscal policy and spending program of the administration and the Congress—because the two are jointly responsible—are meeting with unexpected resistance on the part of taxpayers all over the country. It is not an isolated attitude. It is not confined to any particular part of the country. These protests, letters, telegrams, and telephone messages are coming from every State in the Union. They are coming in from large taxpayers and small taxpayers. The situation represents what amounts to a national uprising.

People are getting tired of paying a dollar for 50 cents worth of food. They are getting tired of paying twice the rental they paid a few years ago on the house in which they live. They are getting tired of a dollar that is falling in value so rapidly that the cost of hospitalization makes the average breadwinner apprehensive of the time when he or any member of his family require medical attention. People are getting tired of the depreciating value of the dollar, which is wiping out more than half of the purchasing power of their life savings. They are getting tired of exorbitant taxes. They are getting tired of paying war levies in time of peace. They are getting tired of the requisition of a disproportionate amount of their earnings which the Government is taking away from them today.

The Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments are taking from the taxpayer today the largest amount, the largest percentage, of his earnings in the peacetime history of the Nation. The total tax bill paid by the average taxpayer today, State, local, and Federal, amounts to approximately 33 percent of his earnings. It approximates one-third of the national income, so the average wage earner today out of his 6-day week, works 2 days for the Government and has left for himself and his family only 4 days' pay.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman said it was the highest tax in any peacetime history of the country. It is higher today than in any wartime period of the country.

Mr. CANNON. I stand corrected. The gentleman has expressed it more accurately than I did.

Mr. Chairman, there is a revolt in the country and the surprising thing about it is that, whereas in ordinary years there is usually some criticism for a week or two after the budget is messaged over, there is today an ever-growing protest and an ever-increased volume of mail from the country in criticism of the budget.

People are demanding a reduction in expenditure in order to secure a reduction in taxes. There is a strange lassitude here in Congress and down at the

other end of the Avenue on tax reduction and the newspapers are reporting that we will not get a bill to reduce taxes this year.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, there are many here who want to see taxes reduced at this session. We want to see spending reduced to the point where it will be possible to reduce taxes now without waiting another session or another year.

Of course, as long as you have these top heavy budgets, you have to get enough tax money to pay for them. There is no other source from which you can pay these budgets except to take it out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

So as long as you have these huge budgets, you have to have huge taxes. And as long as we have a budget the size of this one, \$3 billion above the current year and around \$8 billion above 1955, you have to continue war taxes to pay the bill. The only way to reduce taxes is to reduce expenses. We cannot go along indefinitely refunding the national debt, issuing more I O U's, increasing the rate of interest on Government bonds in order to get people to buy them. And the budget before us today is the one stumbling block in the way of a tax bill this session.

Reduce the budget. Reduce expenditures. Reduce taxes. And make it possible to balance the budget in reality as well as on paper. We should understand, Mr. Chairman, that while we tentatively have balanced the budget at \$1,800,000,000 we are at a point where an unexpected increase on the debit side of the ledger, a failure to book expected revenues could easily throw the budget out of balance on that narrow margin.

Our high rate of Federal income cannot last forever. Already we have passed the crest of the current boom. Already a quiet recession is under way. In every industrial city they are withdrawing programs for expansion. They are deferring plans for new plants. They are trying to reduce inventories to meet reduced demand. The St. Louis newspapers this morning report that the Ford Motor Co., which up to this time has sold more automobiles than any other automobile company this year, is dismissing on the 1st of April 1,700 men from their St. Louis plants because the consumers in that territory are not able to buy needed automobiles.

Of course, there is a school of thought that the people have become so accustomed to high taxes that they no longer pay any attention and we can continue the program this budget implements of tax and tax and tax, and spend and spend and spend, and elect and elect and elect, indefinitely because the people have become inured to heavy taxes. But that is a mistaken premise—and the budget before us now—and I make the statement advisedly—is the most dangerous budget that has ever been submitted to any Congress. It embodies the greatest spending program in the peacetime history of the Nation. What renders it especially dangerous is that it carries with it programs for future spending that will unquestionably involve us in ever-expanding expenditures in the years to come.

In these appropriation bills, if they follow the recommendations of the budget, we are not only committing the United States Treasury to unprecedented expenses in the fiscal year 1958, but we are committing the Government to a program of spending for years beyond. The commitments are there. They are in the budget. They are in this bill.

There are in the budget some 15 new items providing for contributions to the States for purposes for which the United States Government has never contributed before. We are not only asked to pass a huge program for 1958, but we are asked to establish new obligations to start new spending programs never undertaken before.

If the voters are protesting now, and if taxpayers are having trouble adjusting income to pay these taxes, what will be their position when these 15 new programs go into effect and when these boom-time money trees cease to bloom? Recessions come periodically. We cannot maintain flood tide prosperity forever. If we have a year or two of recession, how will we meet, with the decreased income of the taxpayer, and the decreased revenues of the Federal Government, the commitments of this program and, in addition, all these other rapidly expanding programs?

Just take time to go through the budget and quietly figure out what these commitments will eventually cost. They always start very modestly and, invariably we underestimate the amounts they will require. But they always cost more when the time comes to pay the bill—when the time comes to pay the fiddler; and the time always comes when you have to pay the fiddler.

Many men are leaving today a dubious heritage to their children. We value the family heirlooms that come down to us from past generations. We appreciate the fine old estates, houses, antique furniture, and blue chip securities that our ancestors leave us. But today too many ancestors are leaving heirlooms in the form of mortgages on the old homelands. If the ancestor cannot today maintain himself without mortgaging the family home, how will the children and grandchildren pay it off after the boom has passed, and with decreased income and a mortgaged national economy? That is what we are voting on here this afternoon. The children of the future would appreciate these splendid programs but they would rather have a solvent United States Government.

Future generations will not be for this budget and the astounding thing is that nobody else is for it. I have yet to hear anyone say they are for this budget. The President has indicated unmistakably that he would like to see the House cut it. The chief fiscal officer of the Cabinet, the Secretary of the Treasury, says it ought to be cut. Leaders on that side of the aisle say it ought to be cut. There is a large representation on this side of the aisle that say it ought to be cut. All the newspapers advocate reduction. The Wall Street Journal, the Journal of Commerce, and all metropolitan newspapers carry editorials saying it ought to be cut. Nobody is for

this budget, but we are being asked to vote for it when nobody wants it.

Mr. Chairman, it was my happy fortune along with others here in the House to serve at a time when we did not have a big national debt. In those halcyon days when the budget came before the Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittees, we asked only one question. "Would the proposed expenditure be a good investment?"

That day has long since gone by. We have been through three world wars. We owe the greatest debt of all time and we are not appreciably reducing it. The question on a budget estimate today is "Can we get along without it?" And if we can get along without it we should cut it out of the budget and apply the money to tax reduction and systematic liquidation of the public debt? That is the only way we will ever stop inflation. That is the only way we will ever bring the dollar back to parity. That is the only way we will ever stabilize the cost of living. That is the only way we can maintain national solvency.

No one disputes the beneficial effects of these welfare programs. But can we afford them in this national and international crisis?

We have similar problems with our personal budgets. The family would like to have another car. It really would be a matter of economy. We would save taxi fare. We ought to have new and better clothing. It is good business to look well. You have to look prosperous to be prosperous. The children are just at the growing age and ought to have better and more expensive cuts of meat on the dinner table. Childhood diets should not be too monotonous. But when you go down to the bank to renew your note, the banker is going to wonder if it was expedient to buy that extra car or that expensive clothing or to take that little summer vacation to relieve your jangled nerves.

So, Mr. Chairman, the rule is changed. Whereas before the war—when we had no pressing debts, when we were meeting our obligations, when our total budget was less than the amount we pay today for interest on the Federal debt—then the only question was, "Would this be a good investment?" But today the question is, can we get along without it? We cannot meet every need. We cannot finance every program. We cannot wipe away every tear.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York to yield a minute to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman. I am sorry that he could not yield to me earlier, but I am very glad to have heard the full discourse. I want to compliment the gentleman on what I think has been a most adequate description of the present mood of the country. I would compliment the gentleman, too, on his own indicated promise to do what he can do to cut the budget. My question

briefly is this. I remember that the House Committee on Appropriations has been held in the highest regard for many years. I have seen it able to act to reduce substantially the President's budget. I am wondering whether or not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has just given such an admirable description of the condition in which we find ourselves, since he is one of the best qualified, probably, together with the gentleman from New York, to know where the budget could be cut, will answer this question: Could not the Committee on Appropriations help the rest of the House by making the necessary substantial cuts in the budget?

Mr. CANNON. That is what the Committee on Appropriations has been doing for the last 2 months. We have cut something like 6 percent from the bills already passed and expect to cut this bill today and future bills to even a larger percentage, and we shall appreciate the gentlewoman's gracious counsel and advice and assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think it was a pretty good indication of the real situation when we just witnessed this last talk about economy in general terms, but without one single specific suggestion about what can be done about it. I can say this, and I think everyone here knows it: There is only one way to cut a budget and that is to begin right in the details of the budget before you.

I was very disappointed to have the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations which brought out this bill talk for half an hour without giving one specific instance where this budget might be cut. I would further like to point out that if this budget is to be cut the Appropriations Committee has to be staffed with more of a staff than they presently have; not that the men on that staff are not perfectly capable men, but the budget was cut by the 83d Congress mainly because the then chairman of the committee [Mr. TABER], adequately staffed that committee with a great deal of additional help so it could be done. I still call upon the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if he really means this talk about economy, let him get the Appropriations Committee staffed so that we can pinpoint where these cuts can be made.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the gentleman's statement that no reference to detail has been made, I will say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to whom he refers, came to me just now and suggested that we not take up the details in general debate but defer them until we reach the amending stage. I am merely following the suggestion of the gentleman's leader.

I will say furthermore in response to the gentleman's other statement, that no

member of the Committee has asked for information that he did not get. If the gentleman can get any member of the Appropriations Committee to say that he has not received authentic, dependable and comprehensive information on any subject requested let him do it now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh, I suspect there will be many who will say it, because they say it in their regular speeches when they are discussing the details. As a Member of this House who has to go over your hearings and read them, I can say that the information is frequently inadequate. The reports of the Subcommittees on Appropriations under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri have so stated, that they did not get sufficiently accurate information, and in many instances the information is completely inaccurate.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I thoroughly believe what the gentleman says right here. If this Congress would properly staff the Appropriations Committee or some similar committee, we would save a thousand dollars for every \$10 you put in.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, because we have proof of it. In the 83d Congress they did cut the budget \$10 billion. It was not a meat-ax cut. It was detail cuts.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I am happy to hear the gentleman's statement about this staff. The gentleman will recall that on three occasions the other body has passed a bill that would do the very thing the gentleman is talking about; that would set up a joint committee on the budget, within the Appropriations Committee, to give the Appropriations Committee the tools with which to work. So, when they appeared before you, you would be able to not only fence with them but to meet their arguments and thereby save untold millions of dollars. I have the honor of sponsoring that bill in the House.

In 1952 we had my bill up for consideration and we lost by 16 votes. Now is the time, with everybody favoring economy, for us to revive that legislation. Incidentally, that bill was introduced in the other body several days ago with 71 Members of that body sponsoring it. I hope the gentleman will look into that matter because I know he is very much interested in it and would like to have the tools with which to work.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I took so much time in rebuttal instead of taking up some affirmative matters I wanted to touch upon. I have been going over as carefully as I can this budget trying to pick out some items I knew a little bit about where I thought there should be cuts. There is shown a particular area which

is one of the most difficult areas to discuss, because it is a matter that is quite emotional. I refer to the National Institutes of Health. There is not a person in this House who is not very much interested in the adequacy of the health of our people.

The question I pose on all of these health measures or any measure is this: It is not sufficient to appropriate money. The real test is how the money is going to be spent and what the program is.

As I go into the cuts I shall propose, I will show from the hearings that the people running these programs have said that they cannot spend the money so fast. They were given more money last year than they asked for and there are unobligated balances carried over this year. That is not resulting in better health to our heart patients nor is it an answer to our cancer problem.

It is most amazing to me that no mention is made in the committee report on these programs that after all the Federal Government is the tail that is wagging a great big dog. Our private enterprise system is the primary area where we are going ahead in connection with health and most everything else. When we read in the committee hearings about the great advance in mental health, we find that it has been due to the tranquilizer pills that have been developed by private enterprise, not by these Government grants. Nowhere in these hearings is there any indication of the relationship of the Federal Government's program to the tremendous program being carried on by private enterprise. The Federal Government's programs in these areas of necessity must be ancillary programs and yet they are presented as if they were the basic programs. There is no information adduced in the committee hearings concerning the basic programs presently going on in fields of cancer, mental health, heart diseases, arthritis, and so forth, in private enterprise. Only by reading between the lines is one aware of the fact that the basic work is being done in private enterprise. In fact the picture has been reversed so that the chairman asks one of the Government witnesses what private enterprise is doing to cooperate with the Federal program. It is time we settled which program is basic, the Federal Government or private enterprise, and which ancillary.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak for a moment about the staff of the Appropriations Committee because I think the membership should have information as to just what the situation is. We have a staff of approximately 30 regular employees. It consists of men of long experience in the committee and with a long legislative background. Some of them are graduates of the FBI, some of them have been taken on from other agencies.

We have no difficulty in having the research work that is required by the committee done by those men. They cover the field in magnificent style.

There is not a single thing in the bill that was sent over here by the other

body which in the slightest degree would help the Appropriations Committee in getting at anything. It provides for a joint setup of research people which would be simply a duplication of effort, and I am afraid that it would be controlled by the other body so that we would get nowhere and have no information that could possibly be used successfully by us. It would permit increases in appropriations by the other body to be promoted beyond endurance.

Now, those of us who wish to keep appropriations down do not want to see that kind of a bill pass and, for my part, I cannot be a party to it. That bill would not provide for investigators of the type that we used in the 83d Congress in the slightest degree. They could not come within the provisions of that bill. They could not be of the slightest use. We have the authority at the present time to hire all the research people and the investigators that could possibly and intelligently be used, and we do not need any other legislation to bring it about.

That is a situation that we are confronted with, and I hope that those who are interested in saving a dollar wherever it can be done will not support something that would work in the other direction.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to say this in all fairness to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]: regardless of all the publicity that might have gone to any Member of the body as far as cutting Federal expenditures of our budget is concerned, in the 17 years that I have been in this Congress I do not know of any two men who have done more as a team to cut down Federal expenditures than have the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Every time we have had a complaint about an agency running wild, whether the gentleman from New York was chairman or the gentleman from Missouri was chairman, they have asked for an investigation of that agency to be made, and the various personnel were acquired and hired and reports were issued, and those reports were made public so that any Member of the Congress could see them. I think the gentlemen should be complimented.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has stated the situation as it exists.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Unfortunately my attention was diverted and I did not hear all the gentleman had to say in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and the remarks that I made. But, I did hear the gentleman say in effect that the proposed joint committee on the budget was not necessary; that you had that authority now, and that you had all of the necessary experts and so forth. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. No. I said that we had a research staff composed of the clerks of the committee, working on the different subcommittees, that were entirely competent and able to do the research work that we needed, and that the bill that was passed by the other body related entirely to research people and would be just a duplication without giving us any additional information. It would be under the control of the other body, and we would not have first crack at it nor be able to handle it in such a way that it would do us any good.

Mr. COLMER. Now, if the gentleman will bear with me, the gentleman says that he has all the clerks that he requires. Now we are complaining about this gargantuan budget of the President. Is it not true that the President has a Budget Bureau of between 400 and 500 employees?

Mr. TABER. Something like 400. I cannot remember exactly.

Mr. COLMER. Can the gentleman tell us now what the other body and this body in the Congress have in the way of Appropriation Committee employees?

Mr. TABER. I do not know what they have. They have a very substantial number, but I do not think they have as many as we have.

Mr. COLMER. Well, I am afraid the gentleman did not understand. How many do the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses have?

Mr. TABER. The two Appropriations Committees, I would say, have 50 to 75, without getting into the investigational staff. The investigational staff in the House I know about.

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman tell us how many that is in the House?

Mr. TABER. I cannot tell the gentleman, because it is operated on this basis: There is a director of investigation and an assistant, and clerical help of somewhere around 3 to 4, maybe 5.

At the present time they draw on employees of the General Accounting Office, the FBI and on certain occasions other agencies; and often people from the outside have been called in.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Mississippi has mentioned the 400 and some employees of the Bureau of the Budget, as compared with the number that we have in the House. That does not seem to make his argument sound, because the Budget people come up here, having a much higher number of employees, 400 and more people, apparently trying to find where to spend money, and when they come up here and see our 30 employees we find we are able to reduce that budget. I do not believe the question of the number of employees on the staff has anything to do with the question of economy.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] has just made an observation that I do not think would stand up under considera-

tion, with all due deference to him. The Bureau of the Budget has 400 or 500 employees as against 30 employees down here, but they are responsible to the various spending agencies. We here in the House are responsible to the taxpayers. The very people the gentleman is talking about employing who are in these departments, to do research or investigation work, come from the very departments we are trying to cut.

Would the gentleman permit this specific question? I am sure there is no one in this House on either side of the aisle who has a greater admiration for the gentleman in the well of the House than have I when it comes to this question. But I have never been able to understand his position on this matter. Specifically, would the gentleman undertake to tell use here and now that if the Committees on Appropriations had an adequate staff of independent investigators responsible only to the House of Representatives and to the Senate of the United States, working continuously on this job of investigating, watchdogging, they could not be of great benefit to the great Committees on Appropriations in finding places in this budget where we can cut?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I would be afraid that they would be more interested in raising appropriations than in cutting them down, with that kind of a setup. That is one of the reasons why I do not feel favorably toward the bill. That bill does not relate to investigators, it relates only to clerical staff and research.

Mr. COLMER. Oh, no; I am afraid the gentleman has not studied the bill.

Mr. TABER. I do not have it before me, or I would point out where what I have said is true.

Mr. COLMER. If I had the time, so could I. But I am laboring at a disadvantage here. I think if I had the time I could hold up my own end of the discussion a little bit better. But I am sure that the gentleman does not mean to say that if he had an adequate staff of experts and research men who were responsible to his committee, and responsible to this joint committee, that they would work contrary to the purpose for which we employed them.

Mr. TABER. That bill does not provide for that situation, and I do not see how it would work.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. Irrespective of any other bill or any other staffing by any other group, is it not a fact when the gentleman from New York was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations in the 83d Congress, with the proper staff the gentleman had, he was able to go through that budget and cut the budget by \$10 billions?

Mr. TABER. I think we accomplished that, yes, but that is not what is being proposed by the other body.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with that, but with the staff the gentleman had he could do that?

Mr. TABER. We could.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Right on that point, the gentleman would recall, I am sure, that that was done not through any staff the gentleman's committee had specifically but through a little coalition of economy-minded Members of this House who largely provided their own staff.

Mr. TABER. I had between 90 and 100 persons on the staff of the Committee on Appropriations investigating, and they were working all the time through that period.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, the graciousness on the part of the distinguished gentleman from New York in yielding to me under these circumstances is indicative and characteristic of his splendid conduct in this House always.

I am at a loss, in view of the very high regard I have for him and the very splendid job he has done, to understand his opposition to this so-called joint committee on the budget.

There are so many things I should like to say in the few minutes I have that I just have to hit a little at random. In the first place, the argument is made by the distinguished gentleman from New York here, as it has been made by him and others in the past, that the House would surrender its power of initiating appropriations if this joint committee were set up. I just cannot understand that.

In the first place, under the bill I am sponsoring this joint committee would be made up under and from the two committees on appropriations, from the House and the Senate. Bearing in mind the constitutional prerogatives of the House in initiating appropriations, my bill provides that 9 Members of the House shall constitute the House contribution to that committee from the Appropriations Committee, as against 7 Members from the other body; and moreover, that the chairmanship of that joint committee shall remain permanently in the House.

Because of the intense interest in the other body, I have reason to believe that the other body will go along with that disproportionate arrangement as far as the two bodies are concerned. I know that the Members of the other body are evaluated more highly in some quarters, possibly, because they, like gold, are fewer in number and possibly have a better press. But I am not ready to confess any such inferiority complex so far as I am concerned as a Member of this body. I cannot understand the thing that we are confronted with so many times in this House, "Well, we did the best we could, but the other body overwhelmed us." On an equal basis, I cannot understand that and I certainly could not understand how 7 Members of the other body could overrule 9 Members from this side with the chairman on the House side.

I just cannot believe that my distinguished friend from New York who has done such yeoman service in this cause—he is no new convert to this economy wave, he has been practicing and

preaching it all along—but I cannot understand how he can take the position that if he had a staff of competent experts, men who were experts in their fields working for his committee, it would not give him a better opportunity to fence with and to answer the arguments of the brass, so-called, and the bureaucrats, so-called. Certainly, with a group of permanent staff who would be on the job the year around and who would be responsible not to the bureau, not to the President, but responsible to the Congress of the United States, that committee would be in a better position when they got to writing up their bills.

I want to point out another thing that has not been brought out in this colloquy, and that is that up until the time I brought this joint committee bill to the floor of the House in 1952, that appropriations committee of the House, and largely of the Senate, had a very small group of clerks—yes, efficient men, good men, men who were doing a good job and who were responsible to the Committee on Appropriations, but who were largely housekeepers and clerks, markup clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

When we brought that bill here, it looked like we might pass it. What did the Committee on Appropriations do? They came in, may I say to my friend from Ohio, with an amendment to a pending appropriation bill which set up \$250,000 to employ additional staff. I have not been able to find out whether they ever used that money or not although I queried the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations recently when he was before the Committee on Rules. In my judgment, and I may be wrong, but you pass judgment on it yourselves on your responsibility, the point I am trying to bring out is that when these bureaus come up here before the Committee on Appropriations, the committee sitting there in subcommittee with one or two clerks, members of the committee are largely at the mercy of those who appear, advocating and upholding the recommendations in that budget. If I am wrong, I shall be willing to admit it. But here I think is an opportunity to do something about this by giving the House the same kind of tools to work with that you give the President of the United States. After all, we are responsible for this.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for giving me this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, the Evening Star on Saturday, March 23, carried an editorial captioned "Dangerous Budget."

After brief references to Senator Byrd's criticism of the 1958 budget, it had this to say:

The essential point which Senator Byrd makes is that this budget is dangerous in

the extreme because it entrenches wasteful spending and embarks on many new projects which will compel larger and larger budgets as the years go on.

The editorial continued:

If this is correct, and we think it is, it is this continually rising trend in expenditures which poses the great threat. Unless the trend is checked, more inflation and higher living costs are inevitable, and in the end we may find ourselves deep in the hair curling depression to which Secretary Humphrey has alluded.

Nothing more clearly justifies Senator Byrd's reference to the 1958 budget as "dangerous" than a careful review of the report of the Appropriation Committee by Mr. Fogarty, on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies appropriation bill 1958, dated March 21, 1957.

Generally speaking, it appears that this committee has exercised considerable diligence in justifying its reasons for curtailing requested amounts submitted by the various agencies.

But in explanation of their inability to make more than mere gestures toward reductions, the following paragraph is significant:

Most of the salary and expense items in the bill show increases in 1958 over 1957. That is, in several instances, due mainly to increased workload placed on these departments and agencies by the substantial expansion of many of their programs by the last Congress, such as the amendments to the Social Security Act, increase in the minimum wage, the new Walter Pollution Control Act, etc.

In most instances, however, these increases are made up largely of mandatory increases in costs. The most significant of these is the new and mandatory item of contribution to the civil service retirement fund, which will be an expense in 1958 but not in 1957. This one new item of expense amounts to approximately \$10 million for salaries provided in this bill.

When we review the acts of former sessions of Congress revealing 1 by 1 into the hundreds the creation of new bureaus, new agencies, new wage levels, new welfare schemes, and accompanying pressures for added Federal employees requiring housing, working facilities, travel allowances, shorter work weeks, insurance protection, medical and hospital care, and retirement benefits, it is little wonder that the cost of our Government has far outgrown the financial ability of the taxpaying public to assume. And because of recurrent and continued pressure by organized groups to attain an advantage over the last one so provided for, we Members of Congress seem unable to appraise these requests in the light of future costs, as Government grows steadily bigger, manned by an ever increasing number of civilian employees.

Nor is this trend confined to continental United States. Overseas agencies are just as prone to measure their success by finding new projects to expand their activities in order to justify more employees and increase their budget demands year by year, thereby placing their employees in position to build for themselves substantial retirement benefits.

With American citizens working 2 days of each week to contribute to Government costs, what have they to look forward to if the present trends of increased Federal employment plus the cost of retirement privilege makes future huge budgets mandatory?

The Appropriations Committee has faced this situation head on and sounded the warning in terms no Member of Congress can fail to understand.

Since this report deals entirely with civil agencies, it makes no reference to foreign aid or to national defense. To the extent to which civilian employees are engaged in the Armed Forces and economic and technical foreign aid programs, there is little doubt that the same tendency prevails wherever Federal employees are engaged.

The spending habit seems to have impaired the good judgment of legislators and public officials charged with the custody of other people's money. What chance has the taxpayer who is at the mercy of a spendthrift Congress? And what chance has he of tax relief when the Congress continues to authorize an ever-growing peacetime budget with increasing mandatory items?

People in my district are losing faith in their Government because of this huge peacetime budget. They say plainly unless present officials show some success in reducing present spending, they can, and will, be replaced by candidates who are definitely committed to reduce both taxes and public spending. They have come to realize that the Congress is primarily responsible for the fix we are in and are acutely aware that only the Congress has the power to tighten the purse strings.

But what can he do about it when the officials he elects to Congress on their promises to practice economy, close their eyes to all pleas for economy and succumb to pressures of selfish groups seeking subsidies or donations for their immediate ends? If he votes as he now feels, the next Congress will greet many new faces.

Extravagant habits of the past several administrations have at last become common knowledge of the average United States citizen. Members who aspire to return to Congress will do well to heed the handwriting on the wall.

At no time during the last two decades have the people of this Nation reacted in such universally critical terms against the abuses of taxing and spending powers by Government officeholders.

It is high time these elected and appointed officials in all branches of our Government awakened to the fact that this is still a democratic country where an informed public, aroused and resentful, are not barred from expending their dissatisfaction at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again, regardless of past influences and pressures from whatever source, the Congress of the United States, empowered by the Constitution with the enactment of laws, the levying of taxes, and a determination of budgets, cannot evade its responsibility for the existing overmanned bureaucracy that constitutes our Federal Government today. Just as the Congress must bear the responsibility for its crea-

tion, so do the American people demand that the Congress take immediate steps to reduce Federal Government and administrative costs consistent with the demands of peacetime economy.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has just remarked when representatives of the bureaus appear before our committee that the members of the committee are at their mercy.

If this be true, it is entirely due to the growing tendency of Members of Congress, after years of experience and observation of bureaucratic methods, to still subvert their own judgment to the appeals of the bureau spokesmen.

Just as long as the Congress permits the creation of more bureaus and more civil employees, just so long will they face demands for annually increasing budgets.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anybody can question my sincerity about effecting economy in the conduct of our Government, and in reducing taxes to give relief to the long-suffering American people who have willingly and generously carried the burdens and responsibilities of unfortunate people all over the world and have done so to the extent of many billions of dollars over the past 10 or more years. There will be many places to make cuts on appropriation bills. I will be anxious to see the attitude and thinking of the membership, particularly when we come to the foreign aid appropriation of some \$4 billion. There will be an opportunity to really make some effective and substantial reductions that may be of material help in balancing the budget and affording relief to the American taxpayers.

I am particularly interested in our aged people who, in the declining years of their life, need our assistance. On page 32 of the bill it states:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to permanent and permanently disabled.

Those are deserving old people and others who need our help. I know that the appropriation established is \$1,600,000,000. The question I would like to propound to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], whom I want to compliment on his very fine work over a long period of years, in behalf of programs of health and welfare. He has by his untiring work earned and deserves the highest commendations of the membership on both sides of the aisle.

I would like to ask the gentleman if the \$1,600,000,000 grants to States will maintain the average national pension now received by our aged, blind, dependent children, and other people. Is it adequate, I would like to be assured, to take care of them as they have been taken care of in the past?

Mr. FOGARTY. The budget request was \$1,679,000,000. It also asked for \$2,500,000 for a training program of per-

sonnel in the public assistance program. They also asked for \$2,080,000 for a new program in cooperative research to find better methods of dealing with these people on public assistance. With the enactment of the social security amendments last year, it was the feeling of the committee that with those two projects, \$2,500,000 and \$2,080,000, and with the new social security amendments, this would be sufficient to meet the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is \$200 million more than they had available in 1957. If it turns out that we have a depression or a recession or something like that and more people go on the public-assistance rolls, then it will be the responsibility of the Congress to meet that workload, because of some such situation.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman. We have a deep and sympathetic interest in all of the people of the free world, but we should look after our own people who are in need of assistance. If there is going to be any reduction in the budget, let us see that no attempts are made that would cause additional hardships to these people who in the declining years of their lives need our help. I am glad that the gentleman has assured me that the \$1,600,000,000 is adequate to take care of their requirements during the coming year.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned by the growing increases in the payroll of this Government. In 1952, as I recall, the payroll was down to approximately 2 million civilian employees. Today it is more than 2,400,000. And I take no consolation from the fact that apparently this bill provides—I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will correct me if I am wrong—for an increase of some 1,200 new employees—additions to the payroll.

I am not only concerned but I am irritated by the fact, in addition to these personnel increases, that are going on not only in this bill but in other bills, that Congress is approving the employment of consultants and engineering management firms all over the landscape. I call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to his own remarks in the hearings as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY. You have had a management consultant team come in and make a survey of the Department of Labor. Whatever happened as a result of that?

So far as I have been able to read the hearings, no answer was provided as to what happened as a result of this management team being employed in the Department of Labor.

Turning further into the hearings I call attention to pages 266 and 267 of the hearings. Look at the experts and management consultants that were employed in 1956 by the Department of Labor. The chairman of the subcom-

mittee asked that they be identified. They are identified as to name and that is all. I do not know what their qualifications were for the jobs they held. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee can tell me, are these consultants and experts all college professors, or what are they?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot tell the gentleman. It is your Secretary of Labor who hired them.

Mr. GROSS. That is scarcely an answer.

Mr. FOGARTY. They were hired without consulting the committee, I might say, and this survey was made without consultation with the committee, and having known it was going on, I did ask that question this year in the hearings, "What savings, if any, have resulted from these surveys that have been made." And, the answer was "Just better management in the department." That was about the best answer we could get.

Mr. GROSS. I recall the hiring of a management-engineering firm by the Department of State some 3 or 4 years ago—1953, I believe it was. They employed Heller & Associates and paid them at the rate of approximately \$5,000 per man-month. Still employment in the State Department goes up and up, as it apparently will in the Department of Labor if this bill is enacted.

Mr. FOGARTY. They did the same thing in the Post Office, did they not?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; they did. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me what all these consultants and experts cost?

Mr. FOGARTY. As I remember, I do not believe we got any costs.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the chairman of the subcommittee that when this bill comes under the 5-minute rule I am going to offer an amendment which in effect will provide that no consultants or so-called experts can be hired without coming to the proper committee of the Congress to justify their hiring. I will offer that as an amendment, and I hope the gentleman will accept it, because I am getting sick and tired of seeing management-consultant firms hired and these firms paid as high as \$5,000 per man-month.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee can offer any comment, general or specific, which accounts for the 1,200 added employees. Is this supposed to be all attributed to new authorizations by the Congress?

Mr. FOGARTY. In the entire bill, you mean?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. The great majority of it, I will say at least 90 percent, is attributable to legislation that most of us voted for by big majorities in the last couple of years. The easiest way to do something about these appropriations, especially in a bill like this, is to repeal some of these bills that we voted for in the last couple of years. That is the easiest way and the most direct way to approach the whole problem.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to address one other question to the chairman of the subcommittee, and that is with reference to the proposed building for the Social Security Administration at Baltimore. I believe the gentleman said that they were spending \$1 million a month in rent.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; \$1 million a year.

Mr. GROSS. Rather, \$1 million a year.

Mr. FOGARTY. They told us it would save the trust fund \$100,000 a month, which would be \$1.2 million a year, if they were allowed to go ahead and build that building, which is not coming out of the Federal Treasury but is coming out of the trust fund itself, at a cost of some \$27 million or \$28 million.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the reason why this building is not being constructed?

Mr. FOGARTY. Because, apparently, of the philosophy of the administration that they are cutting down on all buildings and because of the inflationary period that we are in at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. Then, I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me that it is just as inflationary to dig a hole in the ground here in Washington and fill it up with a big new House office building, extend the front of the Capitol to the tune of about \$40 million, build a brand new office building for the other body, and build a \$57 million State Department building. Is that not considered to be inflationary?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, you will have to ask the President that, I guess, because the Bureau of the Budget has made these decisions on what to cut out and what to allow.

Mr. GROSS. Well, the gentleman will agree with me, will he not, that it is just as inflationary to build a building in Washington as it is to build a building in Baltimore?

Mr. FOGARTY. I just do not happen to believe it is inflationary to build these buildings. I disagree with that philosophy. I do not agree with it at all.

Mr. GROSS. I think it is probably inflationary, but if building is to be stopped for that reason, I am ready, willing, and able to help stop the building of the new House office building and all the rest of these buildings here in Washington.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, after reading a few hundred pages of these hearings, I decided that legislatively this Congress is dealing with a giant in this bill and I am just hopeful that we will have the courage to win the fight. I was really amazed at the liberality of the approach of those in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It would seem to me that they have an insatiable desire to build up a legislative kingdom of their own, and unless they are stopped and trussed up, in my judg-

ment they will go a long way toward dominating too much of this Government.

I may be mistaken, but I do not think I am, when I say that we are dealing with a group of agencies under Mr. Folsom that numbers in employees over 50,000. I have looked into the matter somewhat and it would seem to me that in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare they were asking for an increase in employment of about 5,548. I understand the committee has cut that down considerably and I want to compliment them for their splendid work.

I looked into the subject of research. On every page it was research this and research that. They want to do research to see if they could better the training of social workers; research on the subject of retarded speech of children; research in the subject of the aged; research in juvenile delinquency. I was so amazed at the amount of research that they asked to do that I asked them to tell me if they could how much in dollars was in this bill for research, as they presented it to the committee. They may be mistaken, or I may be mistaken, but the figures I got totaled \$163 million for research.

I am wondering with all of the research being done along medical and other lines if it is necessary for this organization to get into the research field as deeply as they have, and I hope something will be done by amendment or otherwise that will stop some of this research.

In addition, I noticed the other day in the committee, with all that we have done for the education of the people, that it was decided that the Federal Government must get into the library business and into the extension of library services all over the Nation. It seems to me that we can get the people sufficiently educated with all we are now doing for education without taking up this new program and this new commitment. True, maybe they want only \$5 million, but it is the camel getting its nose under the tent; it mushrooms and mushrooms.

I am wondering, when they get into research in delinquency if this Department feels that it ought to take over all of the responsibilities of the parents and the schools, the matter of retarded speech in children, et cetera.

Through the Department of Agriculture alone we have contributed to the feeding of the children \$293,600,000 last year. In addition, we haul them to school and take them back from school. After that is over and they go into college, through the College Housing Act we borrow money at 3.5 percent, 3.6 percent, or 3.75 percent and loan it at 2.78 percent, at a loss, to help the colleges build dormitories for the students. Yet with all of our high schools, all of our colleges, everything that we have done for youth, this organization wants to step in and take over a part of the duties of parenthood in the homes of this Nation. I hope, as we read the bill, we will be able to cut many millions of unnecessary waste in this bill off of the burdened backs of the taxpayers.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, my service on the Committee on Appropriations has been both interesting and a revelation, in a sense. I want to say for the chairmen of our committee, Mr. CANNON and Mr. TABER, in reply to some purported criticisms today that the Committee on Appropriations was not making any attempt to cut this budget, that I know that both of these gentlemen are as sincerely concerned as any person in this House can possibly be, and so are the other members of the Appropriations Committee. We have attempted to do a good job. We all want to cut the budget, just as you do.

I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and the reply to him by the gentleman from New York. It seems to me that what he wants to do is set up a sort of superduper conference committee. I am sure if any of you have served on a conference committee on appropriations with Members of another body—I shall not refer to it as the Senate because I am not referring to the Senate, I am referring to the upper House, so-called, because of the fact that that body to which I refer ups most of the appropriations made in the House.

There is no question but that if the committee, as Mr. COLMER, and I know he is sincere about it, wants to set up, is established, the upper body to which I refer would dominate.

I am sure the gentleman from New York put his finger on the spot when he referred to that possibility.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia to clarify the position of the Committee on Appropriations. I have before me a wire from our State director of public assistance. It reads as follows:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight appropriation bill, H. R. 6287, provides for closed end appropriation of State and local administrative funds, also training or research funds deleted. Principle of closed end appropriation inconsistent with basic 50-50 matching provisions of Social Security Act. Passage of bill with these features would seriously impair administration of public assistance in West Virginia. Limited legislative appropriation for administration this State makes 50-50 matching vital here. Am advised no decision yet reached by House-Senate conference committee on H. R. 4249, deficiency appropriation for 1957. This also very important to West Virginia.

Before the gentleman answers, may I say that they are resorting to a reduction in grants in the State of West Virginia, and we are in a rather unusual situation there in that our State has a tremendous amount of unemployment and there is a greater load being carried than would be true in other States. So they are being forced to reduce their grants in order to be able to get by for this fiscal year, largely, I understand, because the House refused to approve

an item in the deficiency appropriation bill some weeks ago which is now in the other body. Will you clarify the position of the House with reference to what the gentleman inquires about on these appropriations for administration and the deletion of certain training funds?

Mr. LANHAM. During the hearings on the deficiency appropriation bill, penetrating questions by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] brought out the fact that the caseload in the administration of these funds had increased only 3 percent during the past 6 or 7 years while the administrative costs had increased 75 percent. There is no doubt that in your State the administrative costs are low. They are in my State, but as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has told you, in his State they reached an unheard of figure in some instances of 27 percent. The duty is upon the Administrator in Washington to take all of these requests for matching funds and to be sure that this program is economically administered. We reduced the appropriation by \$2 million just as a sort of warning to these people in Washington that they must equalize this thing and that they must refuse to continue to approve requests for matching funds that were not in line with a reasonable percentage of the cost.

Mr. BAILEY. If the tremendous administration costs exist in the larger States, would the distinguished gentleman be willing to say it will not impair the program in the small States like West Virginia where we have a great deal of unemployment?

Mr. LANHAM. I am satisfied it will not. Should it prove it is doing so, I am sure this subcommittee and the committee as a whole, and the House, will supply whatever money is necessary.

Mr. BAILEY. But, based on your action in not passing the item in the deficiency appropriation bill, there is not much hope for them to come back and that you would undo what you have already done.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman that while I cannot reveal the details, we are tied up on that appropriation really on another matter and this matter could be adjusted in a very short time if we got down to that point.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for the information even though it does not fully clarify the questions I asked.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sorry I did not clarify it satisfactorily, but the reason we did it and the reason we put the limitation on this bill is to try to hold them in line and save money on the administrative costs. We do not mean to take a dime from any of the recipients but this program must be administered economically or it is going to destroy itself.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Following the question asked by the gentleman from West Virginia, if you were to change this from an open end appropriation to a closed appropriation, what kind of formula are you going to use for the distribution of funds in the States; or is it going to be on a first come, first

serve basis? In other words, would every State come in and get the most that they possibly could?

Mr. LANHAM. No; it would be on a 50-50 basis as usual. But, it is up to the administrator in Washington to turn down requests from these States that are running up exorbitant administrative costs.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But, under the formula, as I understand it, and if I am wrong, will the gentleman correct me? It is on a matching basis and the cost of administration will be divided on a 50-50 basis—the State paying half and the Federal Government paying half. When you change it and make it a closed appropriation; how can you then proceed to keep it on a matching basis?

Mr. LANHAM. I say to you that if they could not proceed on a matching basis, I answered the gentleman from West Virginia by saying that an additional appropriation would be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. TABER. I yield that 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. One other thing I wanted to say, I am sure we all want to cut this budget. I hope we do not let politics get into it. I want to compliment the chairman and the Members on both sides of our subcommittee. We have our differences, but they are not political differences. I hope as we amend this bill which touches so vitally human beings in our country, that we do not let politics get into it. We have done the best we could. We think we have a good bill. If you have to cut, cut in the number of employees allowed, and let us not cut any of the services that come back to our people, to which they are entitled under legislation which we passed, some of it only last year. I refer especially to the Library Service appropriation. I just hope that will not be cut. If an effort is made, I will take time then to explain the situation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. In response to the gentlewoman from Oregon, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Administrator must approve the administrative practices of the States when they come in for increases.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. Those that are unnecessary will have to be cut out in order to stay within the \$400 million authorization made in this bill. That is true, is it not?

Mr. LANHAM. That is true.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The Council of State Governments reports that 13 of the State legislatures have already adjourned, and most of them have made their appropriations for the next 2 years. Now, if we change the nature of this law, would the gentleman tell me what recourse those States will have? How

will they make up the deficit if the Federal Government now says, "We are going to change the rules—the law—in midstream"?

Mr. LANHAM. I have explained to the lady that we have no idea of changing the formula. The formula will not be changed, but the obligation is upon the people in Washington not to approve those budgets that are submitted that are excessive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Office of the Secretary

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; and purchase of uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); \$1,510,000, of which not more than \$200,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "\$1,510,000" in line 11 and "\$200,000" in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,480,000" in line 11 and "\$170,000" in line 12.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to hear the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], with regard to cuts in personnel if we did not cut the basic missions to be accomplished under the various appropriations in this bill.

On Saturday last I noticed an Associated Press release which stated that the Government civilian payroll at the start of this year was 2,403,311, which means that exclusive of the military we have in the last 12 months added 48,119 civilians to the Federal payroll. If we multiply that by the average salary of, roughly, \$5,000, it amounts to almost a quarter of a billion dollars in increased salaries alone during the last year.

I call particular attention to the personnel in these two departments. In 1956—that is in the appropriations for fiscal 1956—both of these departments were given funds to hire substantially more people than they now have or have ever had on the payroll. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as of the 28th of February had 28,041 people; yet they were allowed to have under the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956 28,503 or 462 people that they have not employed. In 1957 this figure was raised to 30,994, which is substantially 3,000 people more than they have been able to employ.

This bill goes further and places another 2,000 employees on the Government payroll when they have not even

filled the vacancies that have existed for almost 2 years.

The particular amendment that I have offered is one of a series which I hope will be adopted to reduce the Government personnel back to the figures authorized in the 1957 fiscal year appropriation. In other words, I am not attempting any roll-back. The amendment would allow them the amount they were authorized to hire under the 1957 appropriation bill and which they have not even reached at the present time. The particular amendment that is pending applies to a reduction of \$30,000 in the office of the Secretary. The purpose of that additional \$30,000 is to employ three people, one to work on the South American desk of the International Labor Organization activities, another to work on the Near East desk and another who is supposed to be a general expert overall. I think these jobs can be eliminated in this new appropriation bill and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the very able gentleman who has just been speaking on this very important subject. I am quite sure if all of us would look through the committee report we will find that one of the most amazing things in the committee report is the fact we are constantly being faced with increased personnel. I do want to compliment the gentleman and I hope he will offer further amendments in connection with other agencies where they have increased unnecessarily the number of personnel.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman and I again wish to assure the committee that the reductions proposed are all for new employees over and above the amount permitted under the fiscal year 1957 appropriation bill.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us when there is State participation in administering a program how those employees are counted? Would they come under the limitations the gentleman is referring to or would they be set aside?

Mr. BUDGE. With respect to this particular amendment, this is entirely a Federal Government matter. I do not believe that any of the series of amendments which I hope will be adopted will relate to any State employees.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment because, as I said awhile ago, certainly something is going to have to be done to stop the steady growth of employment in the Federal Government which, as the gentleman from Idaho has well stated, now totals more than 2.4 million employees, an increase from about 1952 of at least 400,000.

I also take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what is meant by the revolving fund. Can the gentleman tell me what is meant by this revolving fund which is referred to in the hearings, and can it be used for the payment of personnel, consultants, experts, and so on and so forth?

Mr. FOGARTY. Not for experts, no. We cut out the original request for \$150,000 in this revolving fund and then spelled out in the report just what it is to be used for. On page 2, in the second paragraph, it says that it will be for central reproduction service, central visual exhibit service, central supply service, and so forth, and telephone, mail, and messenger services. It is limited to those things in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. And the present bill does not contain the broad language that was proposed in the bill sent to the committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, it does not. We cut that out.

Mr. GROSS. That is all cut out and this revolving fund cannot be used except for those things?

Mr. FOGARTY. Only for these specific things spelled out in the bill on page 2.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I wonder if the gentleman could further explain to me why there is an appropriation in this bill for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, that is something that the local interests in the neighborhood, in the Potomac River basin, got this Congress to pass, and there is an annual contribution of \$5,000 that we pay toward the establishment and workings of that commission, and it is just one of those things that have been helping the local area here in their problem in the Potomac River.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the Committee on Appropriations, with equal facility, would provide an appropriation for the Missouri River basin, the Mississippi River basin, and the Ohio River basin?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman would introduce legislation and it would pass Congress later, like some of these other bills in the last couple of years, by an overwhelming vote, I would certainly do my best to have it included.

Mr. GROSS. Including the \$15 million bridge across the Potomac at Jones Point and connecting the States of Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. FOGARTY. If Congress authorized it, I certainly would try to carry out the dictates of the Members of Congress. I am only too willing to cooperate.

Mr. GROSS. Those are some of the authorizations, which the gentleman has

been talking about, which come back to haunt us in the future.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I suppose the gentleman will want to defend that \$15 million bridge.

Mr. HYDE. No; I just want to explain the \$5,000 for the Potomac River Basin. That is paid by the Federal Government pursuant to a compact between Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Each of the jurisdictions contributes \$5,000 and the Federal Government contributes \$5,000 toward planning and for the development of methods by which pollution can be controlled in the Potomac River.

Mr. GROSS. So the Federal Government has been compacted into a spending item between the States of Virginia, Maryland, and whatever other adjoining States there are.

Mr. HYDE. It is a State compact of five jurisdictions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to ask the chairman of the subcommittee having the bill in charge a question about this "International labor affairs." Just what do you want these additional employees for?

Mr. FOGARTY. As the gentleman from Idaho explained, there is 1 for the Far East, there is 1 for Latin America, and there is a topside job here in the Department of Labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Pardon me. I did not make my question clear.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think they said they needed 1 or 2 secretaries.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What are they supposed to do? What are their duties?

Mr. FOGARTY. They are working with the Department of State in international affairs, and their main duty is to be working with the labor movements in most of the countries that we have dealings with. It is very strongly supported by your President—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whose President?

Mr. FOGARTY. Your President and my President, and by the Secretary of Labor. There was some controversy over the United States taking part in the International Labor Organization meeting at Geneva, but the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have voted to participate this year, even though they had not before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. We may assume that the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have some business interests abroad.

Reading the paper this morning it appeared that the importation of small automobiles into this country has more than doubled in the past year. That may mean that the more cars they sell here, the less our own manufacturers sell.

It will be noticed, too, that the labor organizations, especially that repre-

sented by Mr. Reuther—well, the A. F. of L., too—are advocating—at least according to the literature they sent to my office, by mistake probably, and also according to the labor papers—they are advocating that we should raise the scale of wages abroad. They advocate that we should send technical experts over there to tell the people how to make better automobiles for less money. And the net result, as I get it, would be that they increase competition from abroad, which is all to the good of the consumers who want to buy the cars, but certainly does not help the working people of this country to retain their jobs or to create more jobs for them.

They are in favor of that. Then they want to send over there, or he went over there—well, no; my President and your President sent over Mr. Beck, did he not, as the representative of the American labor movement?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Beck got over there, but he was not appointed to go over there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. Beck was appointed or was sent over there.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, he went over on the understanding that he would be appointed.

Mr. TABER. He thought he was going to be.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman knows very well that we play politics with the labor bosses just as do the gentlemen over here. With this difference the Democrats get it, we do not.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that there is a labor attaché in practically every embassy that we have abroad?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That we have what?

Mr. TABER. A labor attaché.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The point is this. We send people over there who misrepresent the American workingman and the American workingwoman. And the net result of what these fellows want to do or do is to destroy the market here.

I see my friend from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] getting uneasy over there. Tell the House when you get up, about the pottery and the glass industry that have almost been put out of business in your district by competition from abroad and how you have been converted to Republican doctrine on this one issue of the tariff, anyway.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think we should hold this down a little, if we are to cut this budget at all. That is, unless we are just shadowboxing and fooling the people—no; we are not fooling the people, trying to fool the people—it is about time that we voted these amendments through and then, as someone suggested, when the bill goes over to that very refined and intelligent upper body, and then comes back in a conference report, let us vote the conference support down. For the last 20 years, to my knowledge, we have been taking everything that they sent back over here.

We have just blacked their shoes and kissed their feet and taken everything they sent back to us after they put in what they wanted. Unless we assert ourselves now, and when the bill comes back, we will never get anywhere.

(Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we all know that the U. S. S. R. has turned its attention from expansion by military force to expansion of its influence through subversion.

Through the World Federation of Trade Unions, a Communist-dominated organization, and other devices, the Soviet are preaching false doctrine to workers in many countries. These false doctrines are designed to appeal to the aspirations of workers for better conditions for themselves and their families.

A small increase is requested in the small staff that follows the Communist activities among workers in other countries. Information on conditions and attitudes of workers often forecast the policy to be followed by governments.

If our foreign policy is to be fully effective, the results of the analyses of attitudes of the workers and their organization leaders must be taken into account in making that policy.

I recommend that the appropriation committee's recommendation be approved.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. Gross, Mr. SMITH of Virginia was permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words not so much about the pending amendment but about the bill that is before us and about the general subject of reducing our appropriations this year so that we may with some degree of hope look forward to a much needed reduction in the tax burden of the people of another year. I have heard a lot of expressions from Members of the House on that subject. Everybody says, "I want to see the appropriation bill cut." Tomorrow you are going to have that acid test. The country is going to find out whether this Congress really means to cut these appropriation bills or whether we are shadow boxing about this thing.

Personally, I think there is not a bill that comes before this House that could not be cut 10 percent without hurting the essential functions of the Government. I believe the House wants to do this. I believe if those who want to do it will stay on the floor tomorrow we will be able to accomplish something very important to the welfare of this country, because if we can begin this matter of reducing these appropriations as they come along by a substantial amount we will be able to do it on all the bills.

Let us talk about this bill for a minute. This, Mr. Chairman, is a tough one. This is the one that has all the "do good" in it, that has all these fine programs that we all love. This has all the programs where it is so easy to give away somebody else's money, the taxpayer's money. There is not a word in here

that I could pick out that I would not say was a fine eleemosynary enterprise, not one.

I always have my sympathy with the Appropriations Committee, particularly the subcommittees that have to deal with these subjects and have to make these decisions of what to cut and what not to cut, because I know they are pressed from every side. We start these welfare programs and every year they grow and grow and grow and grow. That is true in this bill.

You will probably hear it said that this bill has been cut over \$100 million. You know why? To begin with, there are two large items in this bill, one of \$66 million and one of \$33 million, which makes almost \$100 million, practically all of the cut in this bill, and they have expired or been reduced by not being carried on any more. That is the reduction in this bill. But if you will go through the report on this bill, you will find that in nearly every instance the amount is raised over last year's appropriations.

What I submit to this House is this simple question: If we mean to reduce appropriations; if the country is for the reduction of appropriations; if the President hopes that we can find means for reducing the appropriations, as he has said, then is it not a fair proposition to say to each one of these agencies as it comes along: "We are not going to cut your throat, we are not going to destroy this fine eleemosynary project that a previous Congress inaugurated, but we are going to cut you back merely to what you spent last year." In other words, we are not going to give you an increase. If you will do that on this bill, you will cut this bill somewhere between \$75 million and \$100 million. Nearly every appropriation in this bill, nearly every part of it, is raised over the appropriation of last year. All I am asking you is this. I expect to offer an amendment in a few minutes. All I ask is that you cut them back to what they spent last year. Is that not fair? Let them absorb the cut. If there is anything there they need that is cut out and if they want to economize in these bureaus, like we want to economize and like the President wants to economize and like the Secretary of the Treasury wants to economize, if they really want to do it, they can find plenty of room in these large sums that are appropriated and they can just tighten their belt a little bit and take these things off the list now. Now, my friend says, "We have to appropriate this money because Congress authorized these things." Congress, I expect, makes some mistakes because Congress has not been above making mistakes in past years. But, no previous Congress can bind this Congress to continue appropriations on matters that a previous Congress authorized or appropriated money for, if this Congress thinks it is in the best interest of the country to reduce those appropriations or to eliminate them. If you do not accept that as a theory of government, then you cannot do anything with these bills. You cannot reduce them because

they are going to keep on going up and up and up. You have to be willing to just face this issue and say this thing has got to be cut, these budgets have got to be reduced and these appropriations must be reduced, and we have to have the courage to stand up and do it and I hope that we will.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel I would be remiss if I did not rise at this time to speak favorably about the International Labor Organization. I am not standing here advocating an increase in the number of assistants or specialists. In fact, I think that we could carry on satisfactorily with the present number of specialists and employees. So I am not opposing the proposal that was made here to reduce the appropriation for additional specialists. I visited the ILO last summer. I regret to say I happen to be one of the very few Members of this body who ever visited the ILO during any conference. I went over prejudiced. I felt that it was a radical organization which would be of little value to the welfare of America. I was of the opinion that we should get out of it. I left there with the firm opinion that we should stay in the ILO, and I am glad that the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have agreed to continue for another year. There are various parts of the ILO program that I do not agree with. I question the idea of the treaty-making power from conventions and the idea that they can pass certain types of recommendations which eventually people think of as being in the nature of a treaty.

The United States itself has shown that it is doubtful of that part of the ILO program, in that we have approved only about seven treaties since our participation in the ILO, and they have been in the maritime field. So, the possible detrimental aspects to the United States of the ILO will be held to a minimum if we do not go along with the treaty-making power in ILO. However, as a sounding board; as an opportunity for the United States to know what some of the other nations of the world are doing, particularly in their labor movements, I think it offers a wonderful opportunity at a very low price for America. Also, it enables the United States to show to other nations, the advantages of a capitalistic economy versus a communistic controlled economy.

Mention has been made of labor attachés. The labor attachés, as a whole I think, are doing good work in the various foreign countries where they are stationed. I quite agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that they could take on some additional duties and save us the necessity of appropriating money at this time to put on additional specialists. I think the labor attaché program could very well be expanded without additional appropriations for new specialists.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I am indebted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement that he was not opposing this amendment, and to again point out to the House that this does not have any effect on the International Labor Organization as such. It simply means that there would not be three additional positions created in the office of the Secretary to review the findings of the labor attachés around the world.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said about cutting appropriations, and especially cutting this appropriation. Let me remind you once again of what you men and women, who were here in the 84th Congress, voted for last year and 2 years ago. You voted to liberalize the social security amendments, which will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. You voted for a new Water Pollution Control Act, which will cost tens of millions of dollars. You voted for a Health Survey Act, which will cost a million dollars. You voted for the Library Services Act. There is \$5 million in this appropriation for that, and some Members think it ought to be \$7½ million. You voted to authorize a committee for education beyond the high school. You voted for the National Library of Medicine, which will cost over a million dollars. You voted for the Health Research Facilities Act which will cost tens of millions of dollars. You voted to create training of professional publicly trained personnel. You voted for advanced training of professional nurses. You voted to authorize special grants in the field of mental health. You voted for a new Air Pollution Control Act. When you voted for all of those bills in the last 2 years you must have known it would cost the Federal Treasury millions and millions of dollars. The only way we are going to get any economy, if you want real economy, is to introduce legislation that will repeal some of those measures I have just talked about today. As far as I am concerned, I think they are all important. As far as this appropriation bill before us today is concerned, I think we have cut it too much. I think in some areas we should be increasing appropriations. We should be increasing appropriations over and above what the President has asked in this bill that we have before us.

Now, with reference to the Department of Labor, this is your Secretary of Labor. This is a Republican administration, an administration that we have been led to believe over the years has been for economy. You ran on that platform and so did he last year and 4 years ago. During the hearings your

Secretary of Labor replied to a question from me as follows:

Mr. Secretary, is there any place in this budget that we have before us that you think we can cut and not curtail any highly desirable services for the fiscal year 1958?

Mr. MITCHELL. This budget, Mr. Chairman, has had the attention of all of the top people in the Department of Labor, including myself. It represents to you a compromise from the original request of the various heads who felt there were more projects than could well be undertaken in the interest of the workers and the economy of the country. I believe that as presented to you the budget represents the best thinking of all the people engaged in its preparation. I know of no area where it could be cut without affecting the work and effectiveness of the Department of Labor.

Those are the words of your Secretary of Labor when he was asked to give us some information as to where we could cut this budget and that was his answer.

Speaking with reference to this amendment striking \$30,000 for three additional people for the International Labor Organization, as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] has said, it will not in one way affect the operation of the International Labor Organization but it will in another because at the time we did not have any representation in Latin America where it is claimed by those who know something about this program that we should. We do not have any representation as far as the Near East is concerned and Mr. Wilkins, your Assistant Secretary of Labor, testified that he is not able to keep up with half of the responsibilities that he is charged with now with the staff he has.

They asked us for \$51,000 more than they had in the fiscal year 1957. This increase was requested to permit the Department to follow the labor developments in countries of regions of the world such as Latin America and the Middle East.

Because of the far-reaching influence of workers and worker organizations in the political life and economic development of a country, it is essential that the United States be thoroughly informed on the activities and attitudes of these workers as United States foreign policy is developed and day-to-day actions are taken.

The world is still in the process of testing the fitness of political systems and the validity of political philosophies. This country needs to know about Communist activity among workers in other countries. Its significance must be appraised and proposals for dealing with it must be developed.

Area specialists in the Department analyze developments and provide information and advice to the Department of State which is considered along with other information and advice in developing policy and in determining day-to-day actions.

Without the additional money, the Government may be without expert analyses of labor developments in areas of the world.

We compromised and allowed them \$30,000 in the belief this is a necessary agency of Government, that it is helping in the international situation. For many, many times over the years we

have been listening to their testimony and they have made many suggestions that have helped the economy of this country and the economy of other countries. To those of you who are interested in the tariff question, this is one of the most legitimate ways I know of to raise the living standards and wages in foreign countries, which will cut down the competition of foreign goods that are affecting some of the industries we have, where there is a surplus in labor markets.

On behalf of the Secretary of Labor and the request he has made, and the compromise we have reached on their original request of \$51,000 for this item, under which we have provided \$30,000, I ask that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUDGE) there were—ayes 123, noes 69.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder what is going on here. Judging by that last vote, it seems that only five of our friends on the other side of the aisle had the temerity to stand up and vote with President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that all of us are interested in economy and in reducing the budget, but it is difficult for me to understand how the committee could justify disallowing \$2.5 million for the training of welfare personnel in view of the fact that the department itself actually cut the item 50 percent. This Congress authorized \$5 million to start this training program with. The department made a very plausible and a very reasonable presentation and asked only for \$2.5 million, yet the committee disallowed the item.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that it will be difficult to reinstate the item, but if I understand it, this is the item which would provide adequately trained personnel to assist people who are now dependent entirely upon charity to become self-supporting: the blind people, the handicapped people, the aged, and those with other incapacitating disabilities. I would just like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY, if he will be kind enough to give me his attention, why it is that after Congress authorized \$5 million and the department recommended a 50 percent reduction in that item the committee disallowed the small sum of \$2.5 million for the training of personnel to administer these programs and to help the disabled people.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the result of the last vote just taken is a pretty good answer to that.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, now, then, I would like to comment, in all seriousness, if that is the way we are going to economize, by cutting a program that was designed to help blind people, we are faced with a sad situation. Now, let us

be realistic about it. Do you want to take away from the blind man and the totally incapacitated individual the aid and assistance which this Congress has authorized? It is just like taking the cup out of the blind man's hand.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman has misinterpreted this program. It was a program authorized in the social-security bill in the last session of the Congress. There has been no money appropriated by the Congress in past sessions or in this session for this particular program. It is an entirely new program.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman misunderstands me. I know what I am talking about. I know that this is a new program.

Mr. LAIRD. This is a new program, and in view of the fact that the Congress went on record by adopting a resolution asking the President to make substantial reductions, the committee felt it was the consensus of Congress that they wanted reductions in this budget.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not want to be impolite. The gentleman has expressed his views. I said it was a new program that we started upon with the idea of trying to aid these unfortunate people in becoming self-supporting. If you could know what has been accomplished without this provision. Many blind people who have heretofore been totally dependent are now earning a livelihood and are self-respecting citizens.

Are you telling the House now that because of some perhaps ill-advised resolution passed by Congress calling upon the President to tell us how to cut the budget that I should feel justified in taking the cup out of a blind man's hand in the name of economy? That is what you are going.

This is a new program. I knew what I was voting for when I voted for the new program. I think that this one item would certainly tend to minimize the financial burdens which are now borne by the Federal Government and that it would be a good investment to try to find some way to aid these people to become self-supporting.

If you want to economize, you can adopt the committee version of the bill. I submit that somebody on the committee should sponsor an amendment to restore the small sum of \$2,500,000 and let us embark upon a program which would be of advantage in future years.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I just want to make it clear that the fine work which the gentleman has referred to is being done in the various States. Our action has nothing to do with these particular State programs as it is a new program. This

program provides that the fine work that is being carried on in several of our States would be paid for by the Federal Government, to the extent of 80 percent of the check. This does not stop the work that is now being carried on in the States to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly it does not stop it. I realize that full well. But the gentleman's own administration devised this formula for matching funds. The Federal Government puts up 80 percent and the States put up 20 percent. They train personnel and that trained personnel go out and help to place these people in profitable employment.

I say that some member of the committee should introduce an amendment as I have suggested. This is a good program and should be started now.

I am certain that every Member of this House knows something about the wonderful work which has already been done in placing unfortunate and dependent people in profitable employment, which has relieved the relief load. There is a definite and a desperate shortage of well-trained personnel in this particular field of social activity. This program was approved by Congress in the hope that more efficient and well-trained personnel may be made available to the end that more and more of our unfortunate citizens might become pleasantly and profitably employed. To disallow this item could well prove to be false economy. This is neither a gift nor a grant in the ordinary sense of the word. It is actually an investment and I believe a very good investment. Many unfortunate and disabled people could be placed in profitable employment if trained personnel could be made available to them to assist in finding profitable jobs. It seems to me that this is a sad and a sorry place to stop to economize, and I indulge in the hope that this House will reinstate this item and start this program.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest that in Illinois and many other States throughout this Nation, the fine work that the gentleman talks about, taking care of the blind and other people who cannot take care of themselves, is being done at the home level by the taxpayers of the States.

Practically every new program that has been offered and which they are attempting to embark upon through this bill, is being carried on in most of the States at the local level. And the people there are happy to do it.

So I would suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that there ought to come a time when he would cease bringing all of his troubles to the Federal Government, quit carrying the tin cup to which he referred to the Federal Government and with his and their vaunted wealth down there take care of their own people, instead of coming to the Federal Government and asking for alms.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this debate, apparently, is getting into the usual pattern. We all love our friend—I think that is the proper word—from North Carolina, Mr. COOLEY. But we cannot just sit quietly by when he claims that we on the Republican side are taking the tincup away from the blind man, as was disclaimed by our colleague from Illinois, Mr. VURSELL. Just give us credit for dropping as many nickels into that blind man's cup as do you on your side when you go down the street.

Do not assume that you have all of the kindness, all of the charity, and all of the virtues, that we have none, because that not only makes us feel badly over here, even though we know you, as well as you know, you are mistaken. Don't appear to be a good Samaritan. It does not fit you.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. ROONEY, came down into the well a few moments ago and said that he was surprised to note, or was glad to note—I have forgotten which it was—that five of the Members on the minority side had the temerity to vote with the President and the Secretary of Labor.

To the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] permit me to say those five gentlemen have not been here long enough to drop into the habit of voting as the boss told them to vote. When you had a President down there—when I say President, he is my President, too, but I mean of your political faith, it may have been the rule to hear the cracking of the party whip. We on this side of the aisle do not walk down the chalkline all the time. We do not even follow the Speaker all the time, as sometimes it has been said—though I doubt it, however—that you folks do. But of that we will perhaps have a demonstration tomorrow when House Resolution 85 is on. It may be I should not talk that way; but here we are. And the five had the courage, the good sense to vote their convictions. Those young men—I did not see who they were, but I understand they were young gentlemen—did not vote, as the gentleman would have us believe they did, because of the President's views, but because they thought it was the right thing to do.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman would not call our distinguished friend from New Jersey a young man, a young Member, would he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Which one? Mr. WOLVERTON? Mr. WOLVERTON for years here has had the courage to vote his convictions. He has courage and ability, we are all better legislators because he is here. No one to my knowledge ever accused him of casting a political vote. Do you find fault with that?

Mr. ROONEY. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then what are you squawking for or about? We have on

our side people who do vote their convictions, and no one is finding any fault if they follow the President or if they do not. The President never asked for a rubber stamp Congressman. No doubt some few have been or are taking advantage of his friendship to try to read out of the party all those who do not accept them as infallible—who recognize that they, basking in the shadow of his personal popularity, would share the limelight, insert themselves in the political forefront. We will go along with the President when we can, but we cannot always turn the political grindstone for anyone who just at the moment may assume to speak for Ike. Your Secretary of Labor? Sure he is my Secretary of Labor, too. I do not go along with him on everything. I cannot. I intend to vote for some of the amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which I assume they will send down here, but not all of them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I was prompted to make the observation I did make because of the gentleman's statement to the effect that I asked the question why they had failed to start this program which they authorized. He referred to the resolution which we passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And you characterized it as ill advised.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not going to argue with you about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know. I was just recalling you so stated a moment ago.

Mr. COOLEY. I voted for it. But the point is, when he said that, that was an indication to me that because of this budget urge we were about to cripple the program to help the blind people. I have my own responsibility. The gentleman has his own responsibility. I think it is a good program. I think it should be followed. I think it is a good investment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. I do not go along with everything you say.

Mr. COOLEY. No; you do not go along with anything anybody says.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not blindly follow every path that seems to look good at the moment. Many a word of good advice has been given to me by present and former Members of this House, from your side and many, many times I have accepted and acted on them. Remember when you had your picture taken with Walter Ruther who claimed to be the farmer's friend?

Mr. COOLEY. Never mind that. You were going along with the President last year, were you not? He was your President last year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He was and he is. The point is this: I do not want you—and I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who is against monopoly, would not approve of it—I do not want you to claim a monopoly of kindness, and Christianity, and desire to help the unfortunate.

Mr. COOLEY. I have not made any such claim.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I misunderstood you complete if you did not. If my ears did not deceive me you charged those who supported the amendment with taking the blind man's cup from him.

Mr. COOLEY. No; you did not. I have not made any such claim. I feel that is true of the committee members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you through?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Thank you for the contribution. Read the gentleman's speech tomorrow as it is printed in the RECORD and unless he changes it you will learn just what he did say. If I did not catch the trend of his argument—and have not accurately sensed its import—accept my apology.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$2,225,000, together with not to exceed \$365,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 3, line 9, strike out "\$2,225,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,205,000."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, after the last colloquy, I rather hesitate to address the committee on an item of this size. It is a reduction of only \$20,000 in the Office of the Solicitor. As shown in the report, this is for new personnel over and above the 1957 budget for this office. I apologize to the membership in offering these amendments this way for such small amounts of money, but it is the only way I can think of that individual portions of the bill can be reached. I think all of us would like to hold this personnel down at least to the 1957 level, particularly in view of the fact, I should like to emphasize to the membership once more, that the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as of the last day of February of this year were still unable to recruit almost 1,500 people, the number of people who were allowed in those two departments in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956—not 1957 but 1956. They still have not been able to employ the people. I again apologize to the membership for these piecemeal amendments, but it is the only way to reach the money in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk which would cut this appropriation by \$204,000. That amendment would cut it back to the appropriation which was allowed to the Solicitor's Office last year. As I said a few minutes ago, it seems to me that if we mean business about this thing, and I do not want to play with chicken feed for the next couple of days, then we ought to be willing to stand up and vote to hold these appropriations at least to the last year's figures. That is the only way that we can make substantial cuts. I wonder if the gentleman does not agree with

that amendment to cut it back to last year?

Mr. BUDGE. I should be very happy to. I would be happy to have an amendment offered in some way so that it could be done with one amendment rather than piecemeal.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know of any way that you can do it all in one amendment because some of them you cannot reduce and others you can reduce. I think it would require a number of amendments. But, it seems to me, if we are going to make any substantial cuts on this bill, we might as well recognize at the beginning that we have to cut them back at least to what they had a year ago. That ought to satisfy everybody.

Mr. BUDGE. I should like to suggest that if the gentleman from Virginia will offer a substitute to the amendment which I have offered, I would be happy to support him in holding the appropriations and the personnel to the number authorized in 1957.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Would the gentleman yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 3, line 9, strike out "\$2,225,000" and insert "\$2,021,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia care to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Only briefly, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment does what I suggested a little while ago. I think many Members feel we should cut these appropriations at least back to last year's figures. I am rather dismayed because the chairman read you a long list of authorizations that previous Congresses have made. As I said before, Congress sometimes makes mistakes. I do not say that they did in this case. I know that Congress did authorize these things, but they did not appropriate the money. We appropriate on these things, and that is what we are doing now. All I am asking is that we repent if we have made some mistakes. I am calling you to come to the mourner's bench with me. We have made mistakes in the past. Let us rectify them now. This is our chance. I will quote an old spiritual, which is, "As long as the light holds out, the vilest sinner may return." Let us cut these things back to what they were last year, at least.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is my understanding that if this amount was deleted from this appropriation the actual effect would be to cut out the retirement provisions that were voted last year. The only way in which they could be absorbed would be to actually let the personnel go below the amount that was available last year. So that actually you

would be cutting down the efficiency of the Department. If I am incorrect, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is eminently correct. This year the retirement by the Government was transferred from the Civil Service Commission and distributed among the various agencies. It is a small portion of each of these appropriations. It seems to me that there is no agency in this Government that could not tighten its belt just a little and absorb that out of this year's appropriation. Where are we going to economize if we do not make some of these people who are spending the Government's money tighten up a little? This is a small item, a small amount of belt tightening that each of these agencies would have to do in order to absorb that amount. We used to have the Jensen amendment which prohibited a department from employing new employees when vacancies occurred. If they will merely apply that principle and work a little harder and not fill those vacancies that occur very rapidly, they will be able to absorb it without any embarrassment and without any injury to the Federal service. This is the Office of the Solicitor. That is lawyers. Goodness knows they are getting two and a quarter million as it is. They will have no trouble absorbing that if they, like Secretary Humphrey, want to do it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the point made by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] was a point well taken, because it just goes to show that when some of these amendments are offered they go much further than you ever thought they would. The mandatory increases for the Office of Solicitor, the civil service retirement fund contribution of \$129,900, and the extra days' pay of \$8,325, amount to \$137,000. So this would not just take them back to what they had in 1957. It means they will have to lay off additional personnel to make up that \$137,000.

We have been piling work on the Office of the Solicitor in the Department of Labor. For those of you who voted to raise minimum wages from 75 cents an hour to \$1, it means that you were telling the Solicitor that you were at that time giving him an added responsibility to see to it that the litigation under the wage-hour law is carried out. You voted for that bill a couple of years ago to raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1 an hour. Now you want to come in here with an amendment like this and say to the Congress: "Yes, we voted to raise it from 75 cents to \$1 an hour but we do not want it enforced."

Why do you not stand up and say you are against the minimum-wage law providing \$1 an hour? Why do you not stand up today and say you did not mean to increase minimum wages from 75 cents to \$1 an hour; or, if you did, you do not want it enforced?

There is the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. This is taken care of by

the Solicitor's Office, which recovers thousands of dollars for the Government in third-party suits. You are going to cut that down by this kind of an amendment.

Under the wage-and-hour law, in back wages this past year they were able to collect by litigation, going to the courts, \$1,875,000 which was found due those people who were not paid a minimum wage.

If you want to disrupt those programs, if you want to renege on the promises that were made to the people by the votes of this House when we raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1 an hour, then you should support this kind of an amendment. But to my mind that is not good business at all. If we voted for that legislation, we ought to stand up and be counted when the appropriations to carry out the legislation are being voted on; not vote for the legislation for publicity's sake, then come back a year later and cut the guts out of the appropriations so that it cannot be enforced. That is what you are doing here today by offering these crippling amendments.

I know the Department of Labor is a popular place to cut because it is the Department of Labor; it has the word "labor" in it. But in the Interior bill that was up here last week there was no demand to cut it back to what they had in 1957.

Why start the pattern with the Department of Labor. The cuts in the Interior bill were not 50 percent as much as we cut the increases in this bill. I did not hear any demand to cut that bill back to what they had in 1957. I hope on all other appropriation bills, if this is going to be your philosophy from here on out when these bills are before us, that each of you get up and make a confession that you did the wrong thing last year and the year before and the 2 years before that when you voted for this legislation that your administration has advocated in the past 4 years. I think it adds up to just exactly that. You are either for it or you are against it. You cannot on the one hand vote to expand these programs, and on the other hand, deny the administrators of this program the tools to do a decent job. When you refuse them the tools to do a decent job and they do not have sufficient help, then, you cannot expect to be able to find fault because they are not doing the job as Congress intended it to be done. That is the situation we find ourselves in now. If you adopt the pending amendment you are going to set this office back from the 1957 level and you are going to cripple a lot of the laws you voted for in the last 2 years and cause an injustice to both management and labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not less than \$182,575 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employment of the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409): *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for the President's committee shall be subject to reduction or transfer to any other department or agency under the provisions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards; \$1,031,300.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 4, line 7, strike out "\$1,031,300" and insert "\$985,000."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical with the ones which I have offered before. It reduces the number of personnel in this particular agency to the 1957 level. It does, however, add to the funds appropriated, sufficient funds to take care of the retirement payments to the Civil Service Commission and it also takes care of the extra day's pay which is being encountered in all of these departments.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted. It does not cut any existing program. It just keeps the personnel that were authorized under the present year's appropriation bill. I should like again to stress the fact that the Department has never yet employed the employees that it was authorized to employ under the 1957 bill or under the 1956 bill. I hope that the amendment will be adopted. It does not cut back anything and it does make allowance for the retirement payments to the retirement fund.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Does your amendment cut out the \$20,000 to extend the safety service to industries using fissionable material?

Mr. BUDGE. I do not know that you could say that it cuts out any specific program. I think that an agency of this nature can reprogram within the agency and do those things which it believes are the most urgent to be done.

I would like to comment a little bit on the remarks of my good friend from Rhode Island, with whom I had the pleasure to serve on this particular subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for a period of 2 years. If we accept the idea advanced by the gentleman from Rhode Island that once an authorization bill is passed it is then our duty to appropriate the full amount of the authorization bill, then the Commit-

tee on Appropriations could be abolished; it would serve no function. Time after time we hear the statement, "Oh, this is only an authorization. We will let the Committee on Appropriations work on it." And then when the Committee on Appropriations comes in and the committee cuts something or the House says that it wants to cut something, why should we always say, "Well, just a year ago you voted to authorize it." If we are going to vote the full authorizations on programs, let us abolish the Committee on Appropriations and at least save the taxpayers that amount of money.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will only take 1 minute, but I would like to ask the gentleman who just spoke one question, if he will please answer. May I make it clear for the record that in reducing the amount you are not specifically indicating that you want this new work covered by this \$20,000 abandoned because in your remarks you indicated that you wanted no new work undertaken, and this seems to me to be a very important new work and I do not want it left in the record that the Department is instructed not to go ahead with it.

Mr. BUDGE. In answer to the gentleman from California I want to say this: In our private business, in any kind of endeavor today, where you enter upon some new line, particularly when it is just a very minor item in the over-all picture, you do not immediately go out and hire so many people earmarked to do that particular thing. You attempt to absorb those costs with the people you now have working for you, and I honestly believe that it can be done very well with the present limitation of the people who are working in the Department of Labor, and I know that it can be done if they only employ the people that were authorized under this year's appropriation bill, let alone the raise called for in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman, and I hope I am right in saying that I think he agrees with me.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to find myself in disagreement with my friend, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], but when I voted, for example, to raise the minimum wage in this country from 75 cents to \$1 an hour, I meant just that, and I expected that we would approve the necessary appropriations to see to it that the law was enforced. If we do not want to do that and follow through with the appropriate appropriations, then we should not have voted for the law, in the first place, in my opinion.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I am just curious to know, in the gentleman's opinion, how much more it will cost to enforce the Fair Labor Standards Act at \$1 an hour than at 75 cents an hour.

Mr. FOGARTY. We actually do not know, because we have inspectors to visit only about 7 percent of the plants covered under the law; so we do not know. Under the 75-cent-an-hour law, if this will answer the gentleman's question, 1 out of 8 establishments investigated was found to be not in compliance. Under the dollar-an-hour minimum, 1 out of 5 firms investigated was found to be not in compliance with the wage-and-hour law. That is a pretty good example.

As I look at the matter of the responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations, it is this: When we vote for legislation then I think it is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to go through these department requests, to carry out that legislation, with a fine-tooth comb. If we find any place where we can save money, if we can justify in the record that money is being expended loosely, then it is our responsibility to tighten the reins on that particular department. That is our responsibility as I see it.

Mr. Chairman, if you can find in the record anything to show that the Bureau of Labor Standards has been loosely operated in any way, shape, or form, then I think you have a legitimate reason for cutting this appropriation.

There is not a State in the Union which has not at some time called on this Bureau for help—for information about how other States are handling a labor problem in legislation or administration, for technical assistance on how to save human lives and limbs in industry, on how to facilitate employment for a legless veteran, how to find a proper job for a youngster, and so on and on.

Most of the States you represent call upon the Bureau of Labor Standards constantly.

Your State officials who ask Bureau help are not only administrators. They are legislators in your State capitols just as we are here in the Nation's Capitol. And where do we go, as a matter of fact, for information on State labor laws, on how to prevent work injuries, and so on, in order to answer our constituents? I go to the Bureau of Labor Standards and so do many of you. This Bureau answers more than 3,000 requests a year from the States and several hundred from Members of Congress.

Upon request it trains their factory inspectors to do a better job of saving lives on the job; it shows employees, mainly through their organizations, how to cut costs of production through accident prevention; it advises with State legislative commissions which constantly seek from them the most practical and economical way to solve a labor problem. It urges States to set up committees or commissions to study and solve their own problems rather than run to Washington for a law. It gathers information and successful experience from other States and makes it available to all. It works with the States, but does

not try to run them. It knows that unless the States face and solve their labor problems in this dynamic, changing economy of ours, you and I are going to meet increasing pressure to authorize the Federal Government to do the job.

Your committee has already cut this Bureau's request by \$135,700. Almost half the increase is for the mandatory payments to the Civil Service Retirement Fund. We have allowed only the most modest increases: \$15,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and \$20,000 to extend safety services to industries using fissionable materials. All of us know something about—and those of you on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy know graphically—the horrible dangers from radiation in the peacetime development of this new force. These dangers can be controlled but it is a technical, complicated job, especially when industry all over the country is increasing the use of radioactive isotopes and our States must assume responsibility for safeguarding workers in this new field.

Let us give this pittance to the Bureau to hire and train men to help the States. Let us not have on our conscience the false economy which shortens the lives of men and endangers the future generation.

We cut the request by over \$100,000. They asked for \$135,700 more than we allowed them. The answer that was given to my friend from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] concerning the \$20,000 for additional safety services under the gentleman's amendment, should have been that it would be stricken from the bill. They would not have the manpower to go into that new area at all.

In addition, and I do not know whether the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] realizes this or not, but on page 3 of the bill, line 22, it says: "and not less than \$182,575 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week." That means that as long as you have not changed the figure in the bill, you are still allowing the \$15,000 increase we gave them for that work but you will then be cutting the amount for the Bureau of Labor Standards by another \$15,000.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, I realize what a difficult task the gentleman from Rhode Island has in bringing this bill to the floor. It is probably the most difficult bill to bring to the floor of any which come before this body because of the human interest involved, but I still feel that these amendments which I have offered are proper when they simply curtail the employment to those levels authorized under the appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, especially when they have not even reached the level of employment authorized for 1957. Therefore, I do not see how the gentleman can contend that the programs are being damaged in any way.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman knows that in arriving at these budget requests they allow about 5 percent for so-called lapses. When we consider the number of positions authorized and multiply that by 5 percent, we get the lapses generally assumed in the average Government operation. If this is considered, as it should be, the Department of Labor is staffed right up to the 1957 budget.

In the gentleman's amendment that we are talking about now, since you have not changed that limitation of \$182,575 on line 22, it means that the gentleman's amendment will go \$15,000 deeper than he intended to go. In other words, he will not be going back to what the Bureau of Labor Standards had in 1957 but \$15,000 less than the amount that they had in 1957.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, anything of that kind, as the gentleman knows, could be corrected in conference. That has been done before. But here is what I still cannot understand. The current employment of the Department of Labor is 5,160, and the Congress allowed in the 1956 appropriations an employment figure of 5,322. Then the gentleman allowed in the 1958 bill a total of 5,553.

You have raised the allowance in this bill to 5,553, and they still have not reached the level that was authorized in 1956.

Mr. FOGARTY. But taking into consideration that under average conditions regarding turnover replacement of personnel leaving a Government agency, recruitment, and so forth, one must allow about 5 percent for lapses, then how do you come out? They will be pretty close to what they should be.

Mr. BUDGE. The HEW figure would be about 10 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. It would not be better than 10 percent in the Labor Department; it would be less than 5 percent. In the HEW I think it would be 10 percent, because many of the program were not enacted into law until the closing days of the session, and it took them some months to get tooled up and get into operation. In the Labor Department that is not so, because we did not have new legislation enacted during the last part of the last session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 107, noes 70.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS
Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 351), the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law

of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 401), and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U. S. C. App. 459), and the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 598), \$542,000.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 4, line 18, strike out "\$542,000" and insert "\$406,000."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the same type amendment as was previously adopted. It takes the number of positions authorized in fiscal 1957 and adds to that amount of money the payments for the retirement fund, and the money for the extra day's pay. It does not cut out any existing program. It simply means that we will continue at the same level as we are now operating in this particular agency, and that the retirement payment will be contributed in addition to the present spending for personnel in the agency.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I really thought this might go by without any attempted cuts by my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, because this does not really affect labor as the term "labor" is usually thought of. It just affects veterans. It affects all the veterans of our country. It is something the American Legion has testified for, it is something the Veterans of Foreign Wars have testified for, it is something the Disabled American Veterans have testified for, it is something the AMVETS have testified for, in fact every veterans organization has urged that this item be approved.

It is because of your action in passing the reserve act a year or two ago that they have a 40 percent increase in workload. This year because of the passing of the Military Reserve Act they have 25 percent over 1957. This is the only place in the Federal Government where an employee who leaves the service, whether he be in the Reserve, in the National Guard, or in the regular armed services, has any guaranty that his job rights will be retained when he returns home.

On top of that, since from now on those going into the armed services have no further rights as far as education and all the other benefits under the GI bill of rights is concerned, this is the only thing that a person going into the service today has to look to from the Federal Government. Let me repeat this again. It is estimated that the number of reservists and National Guard men who must perform training duty will average about 1,250,000 an increase of 40 percent over 1956 and 25 percent over 1957. That is something that was not in this situation before. So, in effect, when you cut down this increase, you are saying to every-

one who goes up for training in the National Guard or in the Reserve, "We are not going to guarantee your job and job rights when you come back home." When you cut out this amount of money that is all there is to it. If you want to vote that way, all well and good. It is a vote against the veteran. It is a vote against every reservist who is called up for special training in the years to come. If you want to deny them their rights to get their jobs back when they return from training, then a good way to deny them that right is to vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 103, noes 96.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. BUDGE.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 114; noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the acts of March 4, 1913 (5 U. S. C. 611), and August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,600,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 4, line 24, strike out "\$3,600,000" and insert "\$3,399,000."

[Mr. ROGERS of Texas addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is, first, important to point out that this cut is proposed in spite of the fact that in this particular appropriation there is no increase in the number of employees allowed the department. So if on the previous occasions you have voted because you felt that we should maintain the status of the department as far as employment is concerned exactly where it was before, that is not the case here.

By this amendment you are asked to cut out a \$201,000 appropriation for the better training of personnel in industrial plants, the very thing that is at the heart of, actually, most of our national defense. If you cut this out you are doing something which will put us further behind the Communist Russian advances in industrial fields and you are doing almost irreparable harm to our national defense.

I think the time has come to recognize that simply because you get postcards from people at home which tell you in general terms to cut the budget is no excuse for us to cut without any rhyme or reason. Certainly, here is a case where there is no good reason to do so.

The world is moving and no action of ours is going to bring it to a halt. If we do not voice the fact that we need better industrial techniques in all of our employment areas in the United States for our own advancement, our own standards of living as well as national defense, we are going back down the reactionary trail which each and every one of us is going to regret at some future time. I therefore hope that the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that economy can be effected simply by chopping down the budget requests of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, but it is also true that sound economy can also be practiced by providing sufficient funds for the efficient carrying out of Government operations and by the intelligent investment of Federal funds in the future development of our economy.

I feel strongly, Mr. Chairman, that we have an opportunity today to distinguish between these types of economy. I doubt if there are more than a handful of Members in this body who seriously dispute the tremendous job which the Bureau of Apprenticeship—under the Department of Labor—has performed in recent years, and the even greater contribution which it can make to a sound national economy if this program is allowed to develop and grow.

One thing should be understood at the outset, Mr. Chairman. The apprenticeship programs which are initiated by the Bureau of Apprenticeship do not fall within the category sometimes referred to as a "Federal handout."

Apprenticeship, in its simplest terms, is training for those occupations commonly known as skilled crafts or trades that require a wide and diverse range of skills and knowledge, as well as a maturity and independence of judgment. The apprenticeship programs which we are considering at this time are not conducted by the Federal Government. They are voluntary programs between management and labor, stimulated by Government and in cooperation with vocational education. In most instances, these programs evolve as a result of the encouragement and technical assistance offered by the Federal Government through the Bureau of Apprenticeship.

At the present time, skilled workers in the United States number nearly 9 million and comprise about 14 percent of our work force. Each year 250,000 new skilled workers are needed merely to replace those who die or retire. Many additional thousands, of course, are needed annually to meet expanding activity in almost every segment of our economy.

If this need is to be met—and I'm sure we all agree that it must be met—these skilled workers have got to come from someplace. At the present time, approved apprenticeship programs registered with the Department of Labor produce about 40,000 graduate apprentices a year, and about the same number graduate from programs which have not been registered with the Department of Labor. We know from both Govern-

ment and industry sources that the additional 200,000 and more skilled workers needed each year are simply not forthcoming from our technical schools, from skilled immigrants from abroad, from training programs within industry, and from workers with job experience.

We have got to face the fact that there is a shortage of skilled workers in the United States today and that this shortage will affect our future economic activity just as it affects our economic activity today.

There is a very direct casual relationship between the shortage of skilled labor in the construction and home building industries and the inflationary high prices which the American consumer is paying for new homes and plant facilities. The demand for skilled labor in these areas is greater than the average supply—and the result, as we all know, is a higher price to the buyer. When we project the tremendous demand for homes, industrial facilities, highways, schools, and essential public works in the years ahead, it becomes absolutely clear that we must plan now to assure a sufficient supply of skilled men and women in our American work force. To do otherwise is to invite greater inflation and to further endanger the soundness of our national economy.

We must also recognize the very significant change in the nature of our industrial activity, which also requires expansion of the apprenticeship program. We know that thousands of additional skilled workers will be needed as a result of automation and the strides in technology which are being made today. Atomic plant construction, for example, has shown that welders of ordinary skill are simply not fully qualified to do the job, and in the printing field, highly trained printers have found it necessary to acquire new skills as photo-type-setting and other developments have taken place.

Mr. Chairman, World War II and Korea demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt the essential nature of the apprenticeship program. Yet since Korea, the program—because of money limitations—has gone backwards, not forward. The 275 field men for the Bureau of Apprenticeship can extend themselves only so far. During 1956, they worked with 133,000 business establishments, 9,000 local unions, and 2,000 trade associations.

Mr. Chairman, both from the standpoint of our national security and our peacetime economy, I submit that the value and success of the apprenticeship programs initiated by the Bureau of Apprenticeship have been conclusively demonstrated. To meet the challenge of the future, I further believe that economy in the best sense dictates that this program move forward. For this reason, I vehemently oppose the amendment offered by the Gentleman from Texas, and I urge consideration of restoring the additional \$340,000 requested by the Department of Labor for the Bureau of Apprenticeship.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to make the observation that I doubt seriously if the author of this amendment has a single industrial plant in his district.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am glad to have that information from the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Once before when I offered an amendment my good friend from West Virginia made that comment, and I want to say at this time that I do have some industrial plants in my district, but I also have quite a few taxpayers.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that private enterprise has a tremendous program under way in this area and also the States?

Mr. ASHLEY. Of court I am.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is not our fault because the Federal Government does not do it.

Mr. ASHLEY. Would the gentleman care to go into that a little bit further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I should be happy to.

Mr. ASHLEY. What is private industry doing?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They are doing a tremendous job. The bulk of it is being done there. That is the basis of the argument.

Mr. ASHLEY. Are they doing a full job? That is the question. And the answer is no. Furthermore, private industry is very much in support of this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(Mr. ASHLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there is a spirit here now tending to sustain every amendment to cut the budget. But I think in this instance the committee would be doing something which on greater reflection they would not want to do.

The retirement cost, which is a new item attributed to this appropriation is \$174,180. The item for an extra day's pay is \$11,420. That makes a total of approximately \$185,000. You are proposing to cut this appropriation now \$185,000 below what it was last year. I think this is an especially bad time to make a cut in this appropriation. The apprenticeship training program has been carried on through the cooperation of both the employers and the employees. A man serves a certain number of years as a journeyman. He goes to school and works on the job.

This has been a program carried on primarily in the building trades. There is a plan now to carry it to the factories in the mass-production industries.

We know that one of the things Russia is doing is emphasizing the training of

skilled workmen. They are emphasizing technical education. I do not think this is a case where we can afford to fall behind, and of all times I do not think now is the time to cut this program almost \$200,000 more.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is it true that a good part of the increase requested was to take care of 30 new positions all of which would be located in the city of Washington?

Mr. DENTON. As I remember, we cut out most of the new positions. I understand that this item was for work to be done in the field. This program was to take care of the mass-production field to which it had not been extended heretofore.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, on page 124 of the hearings there is a colloquy between the subcommittee chairman and representatives of the Department in which it was pointed out by the chairman that in the past the committee had suggested that increases be used in the field, but that the Bureau had been increasing staff in Washington; and that 30 of these positions requested here was for work in Washington.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment goes far beyond the level of the 1957 appropriation. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] has been offering amendments to keep the budget figures on salary and expense items in line with the 1957 appropriation act. This particular amendment, however, goes beyond that and makes a deeper cut than appropriation approved in the 1957 budget.

As a matter of fact, I offered an amendment in the subcommittee and suggested that we hold the figure to the 1957 level. The committee agreed to hold the Bureau of Apprenticeship at the 1957 level. In that budget the new positions to which the gentleman from North Carolina referred were not allowed.

As a matter of fact, the whole increase which was requested by the Labor Department and approved by the President and Bureau of the Budget for the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training was disallowed by the subcommittee.

The amendment which is before us goes much deeper and makes cuts beyond the 1957 budget figure. I just wanted to make sure that all members of the committee know that this is a different type of amendment than the amendments that have been offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]. I hope the committee will approve the appropriation in the amount of \$3,600,000 for the Bureau of Apprenticeship. I call again to the attention of the committee that this budget item was reduced by \$340,000 by an amendment offered by me in committee.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship in its appearance before our committee ask for \$3,940,000 for fiscal 1958. In fiscal year 1957 the Bureau of Apprenticeship re-

ceived \$3,399,000. The increased request for fiscal year 1958 provided for \$201,000 to cover mandatory increases in expenses for 1958 and \$340,000 for a new expanded training program in the Bureau of Apprenticeship. Many Members of Congress expressed great concern to our committee that this proposed program was getting into the field of vocational education. The committee accepted my amendment and deferred the possible extension of this program until more conclusive evidence was presented to our committee that the concern shown by vocational people throughout the United States and by Members of Congress was not well founded.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD several of the many letters which I received as a member of this subcommittee opposing the new expanded training program in the Bureau of Apprenticeship:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
STATE BOARD OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Madison, March 13, 1957.

The Honorable MELVIN LAIRD,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will confirm my telephone conversation with you this morning regarding the appropriation which has been recommended for the United States Department of Labor for the purpose of launching a training program. It is my understanding that the budget at the present time carries an appropriation of approximately \$300,000 which would enable the United States Department of Labor to launch a training program in vocational education during the coming year.

The State board of vocational and adult education and the local schools of vocational and adult education have always cooperated with the United States Department of Labor in the apprenticeship training program.

My associates in vocational education and I are concerned because if an appropriation is made to the United States Department of Labor for the purpose of training, we will have a Federal training agency competing with the vocational school system in the program of vocational education.

I was greatly assured this morning when you advised me that you were opposed to the development of a training program in the United States Department of Labor. My associates in vocational education and I will appreciate anything that you may do to the end that vocational education in Wisconsin will continue to be the responsibility of our State system of vocational education.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

C. L. GREIBER,
State Director, Vocational and Adult
Education.

MARSHFIELD VOCATIONAL
AND ADULT EDUCATION SCHOOL,
Marshfield, Wis., March 6, 1957.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MELVIN: Sorry I did not get to see you on your visit to Marshfield this past week. Ruth said she saw you in church. I was not violating the Sabbath by going fishing, but was taking care of a cold.

I am concerned about a matter involving providing funds to the Department of Labor so that this Department can launch a training program. There is no need for a duplication of said program as demands for training be taken care of by the United States Department of Education. I know you are a

member of the House Appropriations Committee and also a member of the House subcommittee that handles appropriations for the Labor Department and that you are in a position to scrutinize the Labor Department's request for said funds.

In the present search for funds to run the Government, there is no need to add another training agency. I hope to see you the next time you come to Marshfield.

Best wishes to the family.

I am,

Yours truly,

L. H. DRESSENDORFER,
Director.

WAUSAU VOCATIONAL
AND ADULT SCHOOL,
Wausau, Wis., March 8, 1957.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: It has been brought to our attention that legislation is being prepared to create additional funds for the Department of Labor permitting the Division of Apprenticeship to set up a training program.

For many years the Wisconsin schools of vocational and adult education have conducted training courses for apprentices with well organized programs and competent instructors who are under the supervision of people trained in adult education. I am quite certain that if you would investigate you will find that there is very little criticism of the program being offered. Therefore, we feel that it would be a duplication to set up a training division within the Department of Labor when vocational schools on the local level are carrying out this type of training with local and State funds.

We encourage you to vote against any type of appropriation which would set up a competitive program.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE B. HOYT,
Director.

WATERTOWN VOCATIONAL
AND ADULT SCHOOL,
Watertown, Wis., March 19, 1957.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAIRD: I wish to register my objections to the proposed authorization by Congress for the use of funds to the Department of Labor for apprenticeship training.

The recent reorganization in the Department of Labor duplicates the existing division of apprenticeship which is already a duplication of the apprenticeship training program carried on in Wisconsin.

This is an opportunity to cut Government spending and at the same time perform a service to the State of Wisconsin. Apprenticeship training would still be strongly supported in this State by the vocational and adult schools.

I trust you will exert every effort to oppose the appropriation to the Department of Labor for this training.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN L. JOHNSON,
Director.

MANITOWOC SCHOOL OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Manitowoc, Wis., March 9, 1957.
Representative MELVIN LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: I have been informed that our Secretary of Labor is planning to have the Labor Department enter into the field of training if funds are authorized for this purpose. I am sure that you realize that the Labor Department was never intended to be a training institution. If we have so much money to spend, why not have it appropri-

ated to the training institutions which are already in existence and functioning most effectively with the limited funds provided for them. I sincerely hope that you will assist us in keeping training funds channeled to our schools and help to kill the proposal of giving funds to the Labor Department for this purpose.

Extending best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

JOHN G. AUSMAN,
Director.

EAU CLAIRE SCHOOL OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Eau Claire, Wis., March 11, 1957.
Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It is my understanding that you are a member of the House Appropriation's Committee and a member of the House Subcommittee that has to do with appropriations for the Department of Labor. It has come to my attention that the Department of Labor is seeking appropriation to set up a separate division for education and training in addition to the now-existing division of apprenticeship. As one who has been dealing with the problems of apprenticeships and other trade training for the past 25 years, it is my humble opinion that appropriations should not be used for this purpose for the following reasons:

1. It would be spending money for the purpose of duplicating a service that already exists in the State of Wisconsin and of which I know that you are much aware of. The Apprenticeship Division of the Department of Labor have fieldmen in the State of Wisconsin with whom we are in constant contact with apprenticeship training. The vocational schools adequately handled the matter of apprenticeship training long before the division of apprenticeship was turned over to the Department of Labor. I am sure that you are aware that the record shows that apprenticeship training and other occupational training in the State of Wisconsin has been pretty well taken care of on a State level up to the present time.

2. It seems to me it would be unwise to set up any kind of a training or education program outside of the now-existing departments of education on a Federal level. If training is inadequate in any division of our economy, then it means to further such education.

3. On our local level, we are experiencing an ever increasing load of trainees and applications for training in the technical fields. The vocational school at Eau Claire has had a full load enrollment in day schools for the last 3 years with an ever increasing number of applicants awaiting on the outside. The needs of the industries of our Nation for technical help is skyrocketing beyond our capabilities for taking care of the demand. If the Federal Government is to give help to education and training in this field, which I feel it should, this is the place it could right now be profitably used. The vocational schools of Wisconsin are now in their 46th year of operation, and I believe that this 46 years of experience should not be wasted but should be exploited to the fullest extent.

4. The educational system of Wisconsin provides practically 100 percent coverage for education and training opportunities—elementary schools, secondary schools, and beyond the high schools we have our colleges and universities. For that great number of people, which according to surveys we have made in our own area, who will not or cannot attend college or university, we have our vocational school system for vocational and technical education on a part-time or a full-time basis. No system of education is so good that it cannot be improved, but with this excellent coverage it would seem that

the wisest policy is to improve what we have rather than to add something that would be only a duplication.

I hope that your committee will in its wisdom make the recommendations that would augment present education and training programs of our Nation financially rather than set up finances to be used by a Federal agency for purposes which are not now clear.

Sincerely yours,
W. L. ENGE, *Director.*

STOUGHTON VOCATIONAL SCHOOL,
Stoughton, Wis., March 8, 1957.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It was brought to our attention today that the United States Department of Labor is making an effort to launch a training program for apprentices during the coming year and one which we feel would seriously affect the program of vocational and adult education in Wisconsin.

You are undoubtedly aware of the fact that included in our Wisconsin program is a well-established apprenticeship training program which served thousands of apprentices in Wisconsin during the war and is now doing the same in cooperation with the trades and with industry and one which is already aided by the Federal Government.

It would seem that to set up a second apprenticeship training program would simply duplicate the work which our well-equipped vocational schools in Wisconsin have done satisfactorily for many years and would involve a tremendous additional expenditure.

The Wisconsin apprenticeship program has stood the test in time of war and in time of peace and has proven to be adequate. At the present time there are 7,397 apprentices actively enrolled in the Wisconsin program in some 60 different trades.

Since you are a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department, we in the field of vocational education as well as labor appeal to you to oppose any such duplication of the present apprenticeship training program and to use every influence at your command to prevent the passage of any legislation that would tend to handicap or retard the program which is now in effect.

Very truly yours,
G. W. SCHEFFELKER,
Director.

SCHOOL OF VOCATIONAL
AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Marinette, Wis., March 8, 1957.

Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: It has come to my attention recently of the reorganization in the United States Department of Labor setting up a separate Division of Training in addition to the existing Division of Apprenticeship.

You, no doubt, are aware of the very good assistance the vocational schools of Wisconsin are giving the apprenticeship program. The Federal apprenticeship men working in our State are really superfluous.

Every State in the Union has a vocational department which could do apprenticeship training, so why set up other facilities to increase costs? With the possibility of bill S. 1298, the area vocational school measure, becoming a law, why not have them assume the training in their areas?

In other words, it is my belief that the country has sufficient training facilities in existence without spending more money for duplication. Here is another place to hold down on expenditures.

I feel that the Department of Labor should not receive authorization or money for training.

Yours very truly,
H. H. MERRILL,
Director.

APPLETON SCHOOL OF
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION,
Appleton, Wis., March 7, 1957.
Congressman MELVIN LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: Information has come to me that the Department of Labor is requesting funds for the purpose of entering into a training program for apprentices. This is an authority that the Department has sought for a number of years, and which Congress, so far, has wisely rejected.

I can think of no good reason for any agency of the Federal Government entering into the field of education, particularly in providing instruction for apprentices, as their efforts would be largely a duplicate of existing public facilities.

Rather than increase the appropriation to the Department of Labor, Congress would serve the interests of the people better by observing the results of the expenditures now being made. My experience with a representative of the Department of Labor, is that they achieve practically no useful purpose in Wisconsin.

I sincerely hope you will see fit to oppose authority in the Appropriations Committee of which I understand you are a member.

Yours sincerely,
CARL G. BERTRAM, *Director.*

THE VOCATIONAL AND ADULT SCHOOL,
Fond Du Lac, Wis., March 8, 1957.
The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives, Member of
House Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If you are interested in keeping government out of business, school business, as I know you are, then you will do what you can against the United States Department of Labor's new angle in promoting a separate division of training under the Division of Apprenticeship.

It is not reasonable, in view of the need for efficiency and economy in Government, that a new division in the Labor Department be set up for the training of apprentices when such a setup is already existing in most communities all over the country. These training centers are under local control, supervised by State and Federal regulations. If a few centers are not doing the job they should be doing, it doesn't need another Federal Department to correct the situation.

I feel positive that you are well informed as to the Wisconsin system of apprentice training. Our apprentice training is one of the most, if not the most, important phase of vocational training. Each school has purchased equipment and hired instructors especially for apprentice training. Is it the idea of the Labor Department to take over this job we have been doing on a local level since 1911? Both labor and industry in Wisconsin are behind our system of training. They are not in favor of having the training of their apprentices under a Federal bureau.

I trust that you will do everything in your power to stop this movement before it gets a foothold.

Yours very truly,
O. J. DORR, *Director.*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this appropriation is to provide training for the American worker to upgrade his skill to a higher degree of productivity. Every Member of Congress

on both sides of the aisle should support this legislation.

How does the apprenticeship program operate? The Labor Department does not train workers, nor does it find jobs for those who want to be trained as apprentices. For a job as an apprentice, applications should be made to a local public employment service, a local labor union in the trade in which the applicant is interested, or directly to the employer.

The Federal field representatives seek out the firms and associations involved in the trades listed as critical operations. They figuratively knock on doors to interest the firms in such fields to get behind a training program.

They talk to the personnel men—men who find it difficult to fill such jobs in their plants. They ask these men if it had occurred to them that they could possibly train their own skilled help.

A conference with other related plant executives usually results in such a program being set up. The practice is increasing. It gives the employer more skillful workers and the individual better opportunities for employment and a chance to earn while learning.

The Labor Department helps such firms establish apprenticeship standards. It spells out such basic steps as how the trainee comes into the program, the employer's responsibility, the trainee's eligibility, wages, hours, and such.

There are a number of ways of operating such a program. It could be an employer with no union, an employer with a bargaining agreement with a union, a group of employers and a union in an area, a union program exclusively or an employer's group without a union.

All apprenticeship agreements between employer and employee must be registered with the State apprenticeship council. The trainees must attend related classrooms, which are held either at the shop or in special courses in a trade school. Federal supervisors attend a limited number of such apprenticeship training courses to see that the standards are maintained.

The Secretary of Labor has said and most everyone agrees that we must train an additional 5 million skilled and semi-skilled industrial workers by 1965.

In Cleveland, the training programs are numerically far above the national average for the production of craftsmen in the construction, mechanical and industrial or service trades. The training programs are conducted through the Cleveland Trade School (sponsored by the Cleveland Board of Education) and in industrial plants working in close cooperation with the Ohio State Apprenticeship Council and the Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship.

Five thousand firms of all types participating in 750 registered programs with 4,743 apprentices throughout the Cleveland region, 2,596 persons in the building trades, 1,836 in industrial and mechanical trades. Six apprentices per program are being trained in the Cleveland area. Our Cleveland Trade School is currently training 2,627 apprentices

with about 700 journeymen enrolled in an adult education upgrading program. It is also conducting a full-time trade preparation program for high-school-age boys leading to probable apprenticeships.

In my community, we have through the apprentice training program brought 475 new journeymen from trade school each year of the past 5. In addition, 5,000 journeymen have received additional training on changes in materials and methods.

This appropriation is of excellent priority and must be protected. The amendment should be defeated. A further appropriation cut would seriously imperil a vital American program to increase worker productivity.

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will take the time of the Committee only long enough to read two telegrams that stress the importance of the apprenticeship program both to labor and to management. The first telegram is from the secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor and reads:

We strongly urge your influence in restoring \$340,000 to the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training as originally requested by the Bureau of the Budget. This amount was cut by a misunderstanding that the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training was to assume responsibilities of vocational education.

CHICAGO FEDERATION OF LABOR,
WILLIAM F. CLEARY,
Secretary.

The second telegram is from the executive secretary of the Illinois Association of Plumbing Contractors. It reads:

Our association, representing the plumbing contractors of Illinois, has relied on the services of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in the Department of Labor as a means of meeting the skilled manpower needs of our industry for the past 15 years. We urgently request your support of their original budget request of \$3,940,000 to further their continued assistance with our membership. Expressing appreciation to you for your consideration of this request on behalf of our membership, I am,

MYRNA MURRAY,
Executive Secretary, Illinois Association of Plumbing Contractors.

These telegrams speak for themselves. In reaching out with laudable intent to effect economy it is our responsibility to differentiate between that which is waste and should be eliminated and that which serves a useful, necessary, and constructive end and cannot be eliminated without damage to our economy. In this case, as the telegrams that I have read clearly indicate, there is no division of opinion between labor and management as to the great constructive value in the work being done by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the gentleman from Texas has offered an amendment cutting a program that has had universal approval from both labor and management ever since its inception. For the 11 years I have been on this committee this particular pro-

gram has been praised by Members on both sides of the aisle, as well as by labor and management.

When Mr. Keefe, of Wisconsin, was chairman of this committee, back when I first began to serve on it in 1947, he was one of the greatest advocates of this apprenticeship training program, because it had always had the support and cooperation of both labor and management. Never before have we had amendments to cut this particular appropriation until today.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas does not do what he says it does. It goes far beyond, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out.

This year we had a budget request for a new program which added training to the Bureau of Apprenticeship. They added "and training," which was a new program and would cost in the neighborhood of \$340,000.

Because of some confusion that existed in the States on the local level between the vocational education people and the Bureau of Apprenticeship people it was thought that this might be getting into the field of vocational education. At the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] the subcommittee struck out all that was asked for this new program and said in our report that we were denying all increases for this new program on the basis of the confusion existing at the local level as to whether or not the field of training was going to get into the field of vocational education. I am positive that it was not so intended. However, the confusion existed, and that is why we are asking you to approve this program as presented today.

The cost of this operation, that the gentleman from Texas has not given you, today represents \$190,000. There are no new positions. That means he wants to cut this program that has had the support and cooperation of labor and management over the years, particularly the building trades industry all over the country. This is one of the programs that they support, as well as the builders themselves. This is one program that I believe should be left alone.

I hope the gentleman's amendment is not agreed to, because he wants to go far below what they had available in 1957. There is no mistake about that. You cannot get around it. If you adopt his figure, you have to cut the personnel under what they have at the present time. You will not be cutting any increase because there are no increases allowed in the amount you have before you in this particular bill. I hope, because of the universal approval this program has had over the years from labor and management, that you will see fit to go along with the committee's recommendation and turn down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that if this amendment is adopted, you will reduce the training program for appren-

tices and thereby reduce the production of good mechanics in the skilled trades? And will that not also result in a weakening of the economic structure in many of our States?

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman confirm to the committee the statements that have been made that all of the requests for new positions in Washington were turned down. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct. The only new position was in this new area of training. We cut that out entirely. All we allowed in this bill is the going program for 1957 plus the mandatory costs. That is all. There is not one new position in the appropriation we have before us. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

[Mr. BOLAND addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Texas), there were—ayes 74, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, on the basis of an agreement and a discussion that I had with the gentleman from New York that we would run to between 5 and 5:30 o'clock today, and it now being 20 minutes to 6, I am going to ask that the Committee rise. I also would like to make the statement that we hope to finish this bill tomorrow, and we can expect several rollcalls on the amendments that have been adopted.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the majority leader announce for the information of the membership the order of business tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the first order of business tomorrow will be House Resolution 85. Following the disposition of that resolution, the pending appropriation bill will be continued.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5866) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,

as amended, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding a new section 125 to read as follows:

"SEC. 125. Cooperation with Berlin: The President may authorize the Commission to enter into agreements for cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with section 123, on behalf of Berlin, which for the purposes of this Act comprises those areas over which the Berlin Senate exercises jurisdiction (the United States, British, and French sectors) and the Commission may thereafter cooperate with Berlin pursuant to sections 54, 57, 64, 82, 103, or 104: *Provided*, That the guaranties required by section 123 shall be made by Berlin with the approval of the allied commanders."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. ROBERT BRISCOE, LORD MAYOR OF DUBLIN

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply pleased today that I have had the opportunity to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in extending a most hearty welcome to his honor, the Lord Mayor of Dublin.

I cannot recall ever being so impressed with the terrific job of public relations promotion as I have been with the work being done in our own country by Mr. Briscoe.

In this day, when all nations of the world—whether we agree with their philosophy of government or not—are constantly engaged in the great work of seeking friends abroad—it is a genuine thrill to meet with this representative of the little Republic of Ireland and acknowledge that he has probably won more friends in the few days he has been here—than all other foreign representatives combined.

I wish him well—I wish well for his country, the land of my forebears—and I hope he will soon be able to return to our shores—not as a representative of a divided Ireland but as the official representative of an island republic—once more united—as God always intended it to be.

I would ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter from a lady who lives in my district in Rhode Island—a letter which I have found is typical of the public reaction to Lord Mayor Briscoe's visit to our country.

CRANSTON, R. I., March 24, 1957.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: I hope you looked in this afternoon on the Lord Mayor of Dublin when he was interviewed by the press, and from where I sat, it seemed to me, not a very friendly press.

I was delighted at the information which he gave on conditions in Ireland, the cause, and his hopes for a united Ireland. Every person of Irish descent in this country should give him a vote of thanks. I would write him but I do not know where to address him.

You are the only person in Washington in public office, to my knowledge, who has come out for a united Ireland. There is so much talk about a little area in Africa, and other heathenish countries clamoring for freedom, but never a word about the land that was overrun by England, stripped of everything, and left to die—deeds as bad and maybe worse, than countries she is now condemning. And the brass of some of the members of the press, inferring that possibly the intelligence of the people of Ireland would prohibit them from becoming a success in industry. The Lord Mayor stood up to them and certainly gave them and everyone looking in, a picture of Ireland, which is long overdue, and which I hope will open the eyes of many who perhaps were not just acquainted with the facts. I hope you will keep up your campaign for a united Ireland. If we talk about it enough it may snowball into a reality. Best wishes.

Sincerely,

MARGARET J. GARTLAND.

PRIEST SOUGHT A LOT FOR MAYOR BRISCOE

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House of Representatives is to be visited today by the Honorable Robert Briscoe, Jewish Lord Mayor of Dublin City. In conjunction with this visit, I would like to include under leave to extend my remarks an item from the Evening Bulletin, Providence, R. I., of March 25, 1957.

This article is the invocation given by the Reverend Joseph E. Manton, C. SS. R., of the Mission Church, Boston, Mass., on the occasion of a breakfast given the Lord Mayor in that city last week. It is one of the finest prayers I have ever read and I am sure that all the Members will agree that Father Manton's remarks are most fitting and pertinent.

PRIEST SOUGHT A LOT FOR MAYOR BRISCOE

When Robert Briscoe, Jewish Lord Mayor of Dublin, came to Boston last week, the Reverend Joseph E. Manton, C. SS. R., of the Mission Church was ready for the occasion with a sparkling prayer befitting the occasion.

The prayer, delivered as an invocation at Governor Furcolo's breakfast for the Lord Mayor follows:

"Almighty God, our good and gracious Father, we find ourselves a bit bewildered this morning. You know that the first President of the Irish Republic was a Protestant; the present Lord Mayor of Dublin is a Jew; the news is going around that the Lakes of Killarney belong to a Yank; and the historians keep hissing in our ears that St. Patrick was a Frenchman. Please keep the blackthorns from becoming bamboo.

"But when we remember that Daniel O'Connell was named after a Jewish prophet, and Michael Collins after an archangel whose name is Hebrew, and that David is practically a synonym for Harp, it makes us realize that the Jordan and the Shannon cannot be complete strangers as each goes running down to its separate sea.

"Help us then, this morning to hold high the brimming cup of hospitality to a good and great man who represents both; and to

greet him not as a stranger, but as a treasured friend. And while he is over here, make him in the best sense of the word a fair-weather friend, with none of those 'soft' days they have in Ireland, where, of course, it never really rains—those are only silver harp strings coming down—just a few drops of holy water sprinkled on the windshield. Deign to give him (mostly) serene and mellow weather so that he will go back as bright as the colors in the Book of Kells.

"And, dear God, stay the man up with monumental patience as he heroically endures a hundred toastmasters from here to the west coast who will gaily imagine that the very fillings in their teeth are fragments of the Blarney Stone, as they ring all the obvious changes on a Jewish mayor of Dublin. Help the poor man not to be banquet weary of all these glib attempts to paint a green beard on Moses, or by the end he will be seeing little Leprecohens.

"Deliver him, O Lord, this real Irishman who risked his life for the land he loved, from any professional Irishmen (with an angle)—there are mecifully very few—but spare him even these; the sham shamrocks, the bogus bogtrotters, the synthetic Sinn Feiners, and especially the extravagant psycho-Patricks who love too loudly through a green haze an Ireland that never was. Instead, let him meet our wonderful best; the many, many genuine, practical people who appreciate that the purpose of this trip is not merely the wearin' of the green, but the sharin' of the green—by touring in Ireland and by trading with Ireland.

"Finally, dear God, bless this man, our friend; and this meal, our food; and today let the blessing come down generously even on the English muffins and the orange juice, so that having broken our fast at the top of the mornin' we may rise thanking you from the bottom of our hearts. Amen."

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Evening Bulletin of Providence, R. I., for March 14, 1957.

The editorial is entitled "An Apt Reminder From Senator GREEN" and refers to advice given by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, to Secretary of State Dulles on the need for a restoration of genuine bipartisanship in foreign affairs. As the Bulletin states, "Senator GREEN has provided responsible criticism in the Nation's interest." I urge all my colleagues to read this editorial.

AN APT REMINDER FROM SENATOR GREEN

In urging the restoration of genuine bipartisanship in foreign affairs, Rhode Island's Senator GREEN offered good advice to Secretary of State Dulles.

Certainly, sincere bipartisanship is desirable as a general matter of principle. Now that President Eisenhower is in his "lame duck" term, bipartisanship becomes downright essential just to carry out his program of providing leadership and support to the free world.

Senator GREEN, of course, has been a consistent internationalist, and has generally backed the broad objectives of both Democratic and Republican foreign policies. In criticizing the manner in which Republican leadership recently has been handling the presentation of that policy to both Congress and the public, he is only accepting the

mantle of his position as chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Affairs Committee.

The trouble President Eisenhower had in bringing his Mideast doctrine to the point of passage should make Senator GREEN's counsel of cooperation redundant.

But in his wisdom of the ways of men and politics, Senator GREEN knows no lesson is so well learned that refreshers are unnecessary. Therefore, the Senator's temperate needling of the administration over its belated bow to bipartisanship on its crash program for the Levant should not go unheeded.

Another administrative lapse into a mire of secrecy, slogans, reassurances, and mistakes that characterized policy just prior to the outbreak of war over the Suez could provoke a Democratic revolt of major significance. And then foreign policy would be stuck on dead center.

Senator GREEN has provided responsible criticism in the Nation's interest.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 85

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on House Resolution 85 be extended to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and that no motion or amendment will be in order during the 2 hours' debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this resolution come in under a rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a resolution that comes from the Rules Committee under 1 hour debate. The purpose of this request is to extend the debate to 2 hours.

Mr. GROSS. There is no rule making the resolution in order?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. GROSS. Therefore, it will not come up under a gag rule?

The SPEAKER. It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a privileged resolution. Ordinarily there would be 1 hour debate, but this request is simply extending the debate to 2 hours.

Mr. MARTIN. I concur in what the gentleman says. All this requests seeks is to extend the debate from 1 hour to 2 hours.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PHOTOGRAPHY INDUSTRY

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia for 10 days is enjoying the distinction of playing host at the National Guard Armory to a "World's Fair of Photography." The occasion is the second Biennial International Photographic Exposition which is attracting visitors from every State and Territory, all the provinces of Canada, and 44 other countries, as well as thousands of Washington area residents.

Probably, many of my colleagues in this House have visited or are planning

to attend this "First American World's Fair of Photography."

But if Washington is the photo capital of the world during this brief time, the city of Rochester in upstate New York may be so proclaimed during all the other days of this or any other year.

During my visit to the exposition on its opening night, I reflected on the many contributions that my home city of Rochester, through its progressive and growing photographic industry, has made to both America's and the world's way of life. Equally impressive—as I am sure my associates in this Congress who represent other photographic manufacturing centers will agree—are the contributions to better living and better international understanding that have emanated from other centers of photographic research and manufacture both in this country and abroad.

As I walked through the 30 acres of exhibits by photographic associations, manufacturers and Government agencies—more than 200 in all—I considered some of the unique contributions that photography has made to the welfare of Americans and peoples all over the world.

In the National Guard Armory, I saw people of every age snapping some of the nearly two and one-half billion pictures that American families enjoy taking and talking about each year. Such widespread interest makes amateur photography an important industry by itself. And as a thriving business, it has brought the benefits of steady and remunerative employment to workers in the photographic factories of my congressional district and to many others. In a broader sense, however, it is a source of worthwhile pleasure for millions of American families. An inexpensive hobby for most, and one that is becoming increasingly popular as more and more Americans are able to enjoy additional hours of leisure from their labors, photography provides not only the pleasures of picture taking, but even more important it gives everyone a means of storing and recalling meaningful moments of his life.

At the National Guard Armory, I met representatives of the six major photographic organizations that are making Washington their convention city during the exposition. The skills and hard work of members of the Photographic Society of America, the Photographers Association of America, the National Press Photographers Association, the American Society of Magazine Photographers, the National Association of Photographic Manufacturers, and the Master Photo Dealers and Finishers Association are helping to make photography more pleasant and easier for all of us to enjoy.

Also at the armory, I was impressed by graphic demonstrations of how photography serves mankind. Through many means, photography contributes to our progress and security through science, industry, the armed services and other Government agencies.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has recognized its dependence on photography, and the advances in photographic techniques that have been made by its members, in a demonstration at the armory which shows how the FBI uses

photography to fight crime. There too, and at other points throughout the city, the armed services and other governmental agencies are also honoring the role of photography in their work through displays during the exposition.

In every field, photography has meaning. Our observations of the stars are recorded on sensitized plates and films that accumulate light no human eye could note. In medicine, the contributions of X-ray to our well-being cannot be overemphasized. Scientists and many researchers depend heavily on photography, autoradiography, and other applications of photography as powerful weapons which may help them win their battles against cancer and other diseases. In education and the dissemination of information, a photograph may often be worth more than the colloquial "1,000 words." Scientists and engineers in every field depend on photography, be it to photograph the depths of an oil well or the progress of the first earth satellite far above the atmosphere. Photocopiers, microfilm equipment, and other office aids have proved their practical worth to businessmen everywhere. Some of the most advanced applications of photography—particularly those supplied by our great motion-picture industry centered in Hollywood and New York, and our newest medium of communication, the television industry—have a major effect on all our lives. Many other types of photography have directly resulted from the work of Rochester scientists and are being used by the Armed Forces in the missiles, planes, ships, and armaments on which our freedom depends.

There are countless other contributions of vital importance to our people and Nation which are worthy of note, but perhaps the paramount promise of photography lies in its universality. The International Photographic Exposition is truly an international meeting. And as an international meeting, this exposition deals with a subject on which there can be instant understanding. We need no dictionary to tell us what a good photograph communicates, whether it has been made in this country or any other.

For photography is a universal language. It is perhaps the most effective means at our disposal for telling the peoples of the world what we are like and how we live. It can be equally important in helping us to learn about them.

On the roof of the National Guard Armory during this exposition a blaze of light pulses regularly from the largest electronic flash lamp ever made. In a very real sense, this light symbolizes the great contributions of photography today as it illuminates the heavens and our lives.

THE LATE LIEUTENANT GENERAL HUBERT R. HARMON

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon died on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1957. George Washington once said, "To be

prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace." General Harmon devoted his life to that ideal—as a cadet at the United States Military Academy, as a distinguished general in the Pacific in World War II, as a member of the United Nations Military Staff Committee, and as first Superintendent of the United States Air Force Academy.

Hubert Harmon was born on April 3, 1892, in Chester, Pa. Like his father and two brothers, he graduated from the United States Military Academy, where he was a classmate of President Eisenhower. His son, Kendrick, is now a member of the West Point class of 1957.

Upon graduation from West Point, General Harmon was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps but soon followed his brother, Millard, to the Flying School at San Diego, Calif. A series of assignments led gradually to important posts as commanding general, Gulf Coast Air Force Training Center; commanding general, Sixth Air Force; deputy commander for air, South Pacific area; commander of the AAF Personnel Distribution Command; commander, Caribbean Air Command; senior Air Force member, Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations; United States delegate to the Inter-American Defense Board; special assistant for Air Force Academy matters; and the first Superintendent of the United States Air Force Academy.

It was the latter assignment which proved to be the greatest challenge to General Harmon. While many in the Air Force dreamed of an academy that would equal in concept of service the United States Military and Naval Academies, General Harmon had the task of translating those hopes and aspirations into a vital force.

He did much to obtain from Congress the authorization to establish an Air Force Academy. In addition, General Harmon was responsible primarily for the formulation of the program of instruction, uniquely tailored to meet Air Force needs; for the procurement of competent officers as faculty and staff, and for setting up the criteria for selection of the cadets. These things he did and did well. The United States Air Force Academy, authorized by an act of Congress which the President signed on April 1, 1954, is a living memorial to the courage, singleness of purpose, ideals, and integrity of Lt. Gen. Hubert R. Harmon, its first Superintendent.

The story of General Harmon's work for this new service school goes back to December 19, 1949, when he became Special Assistant for Air Force Academy Matters. Man had recently entered the atomic age, and the clouds of international communism darkened the face of the earth. It was General Harmon's job to establish an Academy to train Air Force career officers equal to the enormous responsibilities of this situation. No one was more aware than he of the awesome possibilities of the future and of his own great responsibilities in preparing Air Force officers for the morrow. In November 1955 he said:

The act of Congress which in 1954 authorized the Academy is one of tremendous im-

port. It recognized that the human body, the mind, and the spirit are more important than ever in our highly mechanized nuclear age. Responsibilities borne by individual human beings have been multiplied enormously by the power and complexity of present-day weapons. Today a single officer in the United States Air Force may be called upon to carry out a mission which during World War II would have required the crews of a thousand planes. That officer must have the courage, the character, and the patriotism to press home his mission against any and all odds. He may have to do this alone in the skies with no other American within thousands of miles to observe his conduct. He should have the ability to organize and lead other men—the skill and the physique to operate at supersonic speeds—the endurance and the know-how to survive if forced down in cruel enemy country.

In peacetime, he needs the vision and the patience to maintain eternal vigilance, realizing that his readiness, and that alone, may deter aggression and prevent the horrors of war. Both at home and abroad he must understand people—he able to get along with his neighbors. In an era of revolutionary scientific advances he requires the knowledge and imagination to adapt himself to changing types of techniques. If war is forced upon us, he must be resourceful enough to rise to any emergency. Repeatedly, he must endure long periods of separation from his family. Through good times and bad, he must be devoted to his country so deeply, that he is willing to spend his life in its service.

General Harmon himself exemplified these ideals, and to the promotion of an Air Force Academy that would inculcate them he devoted the later years of his life both as the Special Assistant for Air Force Academy Matters and as the first Superintendent of the Academy. He gathered about him staff members to whom he was able to transmit his concepts of honor, duty, and country. The serious attributes of his character were seasoned with a delightful sense of humor and a warm, human personality. His successor as Superintendent, Maj. Gen. James E. Briggs, said of General Harmon's relations with his staff:

Probably the greatest impression General Harmon left on me when I first came out here was the very unique relationship he had with those who were subordinate to him. It was not only one of respect but it was one of true love, affection, and sincere devotion to duty, as General Harmon led them to their duty.

Regarding his influence on the cadets of the Air Force Cadet Wing, General Briggs said:

I think he left many marks. Probably the most important was the inculcation of the sense of duty which he transmitted to them by his deeds and by talking to the cadets both individually and collectively. A great mark that he left with us was his introduction, of course, of the honor code, which we hope will carry on for years into the future.

On July 27, 1956, when he turned over the command of the Air Force Academy to the new Superintendent, General Harmon was a very sick man. But the Academy he had established rested upon a solid and firm foundation.

The Academy is his monument. Following the path he marked out for it, it is developing into a truly great Academy worthy of the same love, affection, and respect that the American people have given to the United States Military and

Naval Academies. The 1915 yearbook of the United States Military Academy was remarkably prophetic when it said of diminutive Hubert Harmon:

How far the little candle throws his beams.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION

(Mr. ABBITT asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of name calling in recent weeks with respect to the budget which was submitted to this Congress in January, calling for the largest amount of money ever asked for the operation of the Federal Government in a peacetime year. We have before us today one part of that budget which we have seen grow year after year—and which will continue to grow so long as new programs are added.

It has been said in weeks past that the budget is high because of the new legislation which Congress enacts and, of course, this is true in the sense that only Congress can enact laws and appropriate money. But let us get the record straight.

In addition to the \$2,862,502,881 provided for in the bill, there is a vast amount of additional authority and appropriations which have been asked for or will be asked for by the executive branch. We should not lose sight of this in discussing this bill today. This bill does not mention many new things which are going to cost vast sums of money and which are going to cost even more in the years which lie ahead.

I wish to call to the attention of the House particularly a portion of the committee's hearings on the bill when the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared before the committee. I think it gives a good insight into the business of who is responsible for the growing size of the budget.

Secretary Folsom appeared before the committee on February 11 and said, in his statement, as follows:

The budget proposes appropriations totaling \$3,070,602,412 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This represents an increase of \$564,449,537—or approximately 23 percent of estimated appropriations for fiscal 1957 * * * Eighty-four and six-tenths percent of the proposed increase, or \$477,545,000 covers the first-year cost of new legislation recommended by the President.

The Secretary then went on to say that there are increases in existing programs and that the total amount of these increases for programs under existing legislation is \$173,854,862. The simple fact is that year after year we see new requests in the budget. One way to ward off further increases is to stop creating new programs to spend money. I hope the Chief Executive as well as the Congress will take note of this truth.

The new programs contained in the 1958 budget are too numerous to elaborate here, but the simple fact is that there are now proposed by the Chief Executive more than a dozen new programs in the field of Federal-State relations

alone. Many of these are in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The list of these new programs, requests for which will be made in addition to this budget, are found on page 2 of the committee's hearings and should be read by every Member of the House.

The principal item is, of course, the proposed Federal aid to schools for the purposes of construction. In my opinion, this should be eliminated and thereby substantially reduce the burden our people are being called upon to bear. The proposal for Federal aid for school construction is an ideal example of a program which the Federal Government is trying to assume which is the distinct obligation and responsibility of the State and local governments. Mr. Folsom says the first-year cost of this would be \$451 million, or the major part of the 23 percent increase of which he speaks. We might well relieve him of this additional cost of running his department by denying any Federal aid in this connection.

The State and local governments are thoroughly capable of doing this job if they will. It will take additional taxes in many instances, but let me remind those who think otherwise that there is no saving by having the Federal Government do the job. We have no assurance whatsoever that a Federal excursion into this field will end in 4 years, as the administration has indicated it will, and therefore, the better part of wisdom should encourage us to leave this field to the States and localities where it belongs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following those of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] in the debate on the apprenticeship amendment in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole at the point where the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] yielded to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION FOR ISRAEL

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was granted permission to record his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are now denying that assurances were given to Israel of protection for that small democracy on her withdrawal from the straits of Tiran and the Gaza strip.

A look at the record of pronouncements of the United States and the United Nations will show whether or not there was a commitment made or implied by either of the aforementioned parties.

On November 21, 1956, the United Nations Assembly passed a resolution call-

ing for cease-fire and withdrawal of invading forces. In the movement for the passage of that resolution, the United States, through its delegation, acting under Presidential instructions, was a leader, if not the dominant force.

The language of that declaration called on all parties "to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreements" and "to refrain from introducing military goods into the area." The resolution also called upon the parties to "restore and secure freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal."

I need not say that the right of free transit through the Suez Canal is guaranteed to all countries in war and peace by the Constantinople Treaty of 1888. Egypt has agreed to that treaty in all respects, except insofar as it affects Israel, the only country against which it claims a state of belligerency. No such loophole for belligerency exists in the treaty. Also, it should be noted that under the armistice all parties renounced belligerent rights.

On November 5, the United Nations went further, passing another resolution which established the United Nations emergency force—UNEF—and directed it to "secure and supervise the cessation of all hostilities in accordance of all the terms" of the resolution of November 2, 1956.

Acting under his general authority and under that of the resolutions above, Secretary Dag Hammarskjöld made a series of reports to the United Nations which were endorsed by the General Assembly. On November 6, 1956, he reported that the United Nations emergency force would have the duty "to help maintain quiet during and after the withdrawal of non-Egyptian forces. The scope of the duty of this U. N. force was in an area from the Suez Canal to the armistice demarcation lines." In this report the U. N. force was also charged "to secure compliance with the other terms established in the resolution of November 2."

On January 16, 1957, Mr. Hammarskjöld reported to the U. N. that the Israelis would be justified in the exercise of their "right to innocent passage through the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba in accordance with international law."

Much more specific statements on the rights of Israel were made in later reports by Mr. Hammarskjöld. On January 24 he said that because of the armistice agreements and a decision of the Security Council Egypt and Israel could be considered "not entitled to claim belligerent rights."

That there might be no question of the position of the United States, Ambassador Lodge made the following statement to the General Assembly, January 28:

Under the (armistice) agreement, and pursuant to the Security Council decision, neither side may assert belligerent rights, much less engage in hostile actions.

Further—

The United States strongly supports the Secretary General's recommendation concerning the deployment of the United Nations Emergency Force on both sides of the armistice lines—and at the Straits of Tiran—

until it is clear that the nonexercise of any claimed belligerent rights has established in practice peaceful conditions.

To further clarify our commitment, the United States began sending messages, formal and informal, to the Government of Israel. The first such communication was a memorandum to Israel on February 11, where the United States took the position that "the future of the Gaza strip is to be worked out through the efforts and good offices of the United Nations," and that "the United States believes that the Aqaba Gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto."

The President himself made a further statement on the subject of the United States' position on Israel's rights on her withdrawal on February 20. He said, "the United States would be glad to urge and support some participation by the United Nations, with the approval of Egypt, in the administration of the Gaza strip," so that that area "could no longer be used as a source of armed infiltration."

The President further said that the world "should not assume Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba." He also said if "Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations."

The last event I want to chronicle is a letter from the President of the United States to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. The President wrote, "Israel will have no cause to regret" its pullback from the Gaza strip and from the Gulf of Aqaba.

A student of constitutional law will say that there is treaty obligation incurred by the United States here. That is true. But it is equally true that the United States gave the clearest possible assurances to Israel. The United Nations with the active leadership and participation of America made vigorous and unequivocal declarations on Israel's rights in the area and on freedom of navigation of the Suez and Gulf of Aqaba.

An unambiguous statement was made that no longer would the Gaza strip be used as a base for infiltrators and fedayeen suicide raiders against Israel.

On the basis of this historical background Israel made certain assumptions when she withdrew from Gaza and the Gulf of Aqaba. Those assumptions were that she would have free, innocent passage of the Straits of Aqaba and the Suez Canal, and that she would be free of the fedayeen suicide raiders who had so long attacked her from Gaza and other parts of the Arab world.

Thus the United States has incurred the strongest sort of moral duty to make good on the assurances given to Israel. An equal obligation rests on the U. N. These obligations are made more binding by the sure knowledge that if these assurances and the U. N. resolutions are not upheld by vigorous action, the effectiveness of the U. N. as a peacemaker will be destroyed and it will follow the League of Nations into oblivion.

The United States cannot rely only on the U. N. because that family of nations is almost powerless without strong United States leadership and backing. Aggressive and forceful action by the United States will do much to make negotiation by Mr. Hammarskjöld easy. History and the peace of the world depend on America's choice of action here.

THE LATE ALNEY EARLE CHAFFEE

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], be permitted to extend his remarks at this point and to include some appropriate quotations on the late A. E. Chaffee; and I make the same request for myself and other Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House in eulogy of the late Alney Earle Chaffee, senior assistant in this Chamber, who at the time of his death on Monday, March 18, was serving his 51st year as an employee of the House of Representatives, and his 37th year as its Reading Clerk.

As our minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, said to the House on the occasion of Mr. Chaffee's 90th birthday only a few days ago, such a record of service "is an achievement few men realize."

It had not been my good fortune to have been long acquainted with Mr. Chaffee, having met him only soon after taking my seat in this Congress. He came to me and identified himself as one of my constituents, and told me how he had maintained his allegiance and voting residence in Omaha throughout his half-century and more of Federal service. He expressed his desire to be helpful in any way that he could. His manner was so sincere, so genuine and gentle, it was easy to see why his friends declared that to know him was to love him.

The message brought by his minister, Dr. Edward G. Latch, at Mr. Chaffee's funeral service in the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church on March 21, is a beautiful tribute which I would like to here include in my remarks:

We have come together this morning to tap the resources of our Christian faith and to render our tribute to a grand person and a good man. For us it is a time of sorrow, of real sorrow; it is also a time of triumph and of real triumph. In this hour may our faith lift us up, make us strong, and keep us steady.

And our faith brings to us the assurance of the eternal life. After all, death is not the end of life but an open doorway into a brighter, fairer life in what we may think of as the nearer presence of God. Death is but transition, the passing from one realm to another realm, from one sphere to another sphere; from one life to another life; or as I am fond of thinking of it—from one room to another room still within the great mansion of our Heavenly Father. Our loved one—Alney Earle Chaffee—lives, and lives with God. Tapping the resources of our faith, may be given strength and love for this day and all the days that are to come.

We have come together not only to renew our faith but to render our affection and respect to Alney Earle Chaffee—one of God's

great good men. He began his career on the Capitol Hill in 1906, and was promoted to the position of reading clerk in 1920. This position he held with honor and distinction for the rest of his life. From this reading clerk's desk in front of the Speaker, Mr. Chaffee through the years read messages from the President, House bills, and called the roll. He did it so well, I wonder if God will not use him to call the roll up yonder.

On several occasions, as on this recent 90th birthday, the leaders of the Congress have taken the floor to express their affectionate regard for him: "A lovable gentleman of the old school," "served over 50 years faithfully and conscientiously," "gained the respect of every Member of the Congress," "I do not think God ever made a finer man than Mr. Chaffee," were among his tributes.

In every sense of the word he was a good husband, a good father, and we may add a good grandfather and a good great-grandfather. How fitting it was that the day before he passed away his family spent part of that Sabbath day with him, much to his joy and to the joy of all who gathered under that roof that day. His minister had called upon him the day before. They had a lovely chat together and closed as they always did with prayer.

He was a good member of the Metropolitan Memorial Church—the National Methodist Church. He was an official, a trustee, a faithful attendant upon the services of the church, and completely devoted to its welfare and its progress. He was a leader of whom all of us are proud.

He was a man of high integrity, of sound character, conscientious, faithful, honest to the core—one who gave himself completely to the work he felt called upon to do. The New Testament speaks of "the salt of the earth"; he was. It speaks of "the light of the world"; he was. In every good sense of the word, he was a Christian gentleman. With love and affection we place his body in the ground, but his spirit we commend unto God, remembering the words that Jesus spoke upon the cross—"Father, unto Thy hands I commend my spirit."

One of his Capitol associates handed to me just a few minutes ago a brief verse written by Mr. Chaffee, with which I would like to conclude this service:

"Why these hopes and longings
These constant doubts and fears?
Life is but one brief moment
In an eternity of years.
Ah! but in that one brief moment
Which Nature so endears
The soul works out its destiny
Either joy or bitter tears."

May it comfort us to know that for Mr. Chaffee this destiny is eternal joy and peace.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of real loss that I learned, upon my return from Nebraska, of the passing of our friend and faithful servant, Alney Earle Chaffee.

His long and loyal service to this Congress had made him somewhat of an institution within an institution. Our friendship was only a few years old, but in the course of his abiding interest in the affairs of Nebraska he had come to know my late father and my brother much earlier, which made him rather a friend of the family.

At the time of his death several members of the Nebraska delegation were in Lincoln for the annual celebration of Founders' Day. On March 1, Nebraska marked its 90th anniversary as the 37th State of the Union. On March 3, Earle Chaffee celebrated his 90th birthday too.

But that is not the only reason the Nebraska occasion was especially meaningful to Mr. Chaffee. He married Fanny Pendleton, of Nebraska City, the daughter of a real pioneer family. The Pendletons had come into Nebraska before it was a State. They walked across the frozen Missouri River and set up a homestead in a log cabin. They joined in the struggle to bring establishment and recognition to the forming State. This was the sense of dedication to Nebraska which Mr. Chaffee was to come to share.

Earle Chaffee met Fanny Pendleton at an elocution class conducted by his sister Marion who was a rather talented Chautauqua artist of that day. Though he had been a somewhat reluctant student he remained forever grateful, not only that it was here that he had met his beloved wife, but for the vocal training which prepared him to perform the difficult duties of reading clerk with remarkable skill and excellence.

Mr. Chaffee farmed for a time at Burr and at Syracuse, where he was also engaged in real estate. He became active in Republican political affairs and was rewarded with a Congressional assignment, coming to Washington in 1906.

For the next half-century Mr. Chaffee made his home near to the Capitol and he and his family were familiar and popular participants in activities hereabout. Earle and Fanny Chaffee had achieved and celebrated their golden wedding anniversary 7 years before her death in 1951.

Mr. Chaffee was a devoted husband and father. He was extremely proud of his family. He liked nothing better than to talk about his family—and learn about yours.

His recent birthday had been especially wonderful for him because all his family had been with him to celebrate. Besides his daughter and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. Walter B. Mallore, with whom he had lately made his home, there was his grandson, Donald L. Mallore and Donald's bride of a year; and his granddaughter and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. James S. Crupper, who are the parents of two little girls who were the greatest joy in Mr. Chaffee's life—his two great granddaughters, Susan and Jane.

To this fine family I extend my deepest sympathy, for we share in their sorrow. Even as we share in their appreciation for this good man, our departed friend, Alney Earle Chaffee.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Iowa, I know that the people of my State desire that appropriate tribute be paid to the memory of the late A. E. Chaffee, for his early life and training were influenced by the environment of the Hawkeye State. It was to a farm near Cedar Rapids Iowa, in my congressional district, that the Chaffee family migrated westward from Vermont in the latter part of the 19th century. Mr. Chaffee's father was a skilled blacksmith—a fact which gave him a happy feeling of kinship with his favorite idol, former Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., whose father was likewise a blacksmith by trade.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 28, 1957
For actions of March 27, 1957
85th-1st, No. 53

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....2	Grazing lands.....9	Reclamation.....7,8,10
Budget.....12,17	Labor, farm.....2,14	Safflower.....13
Cooperatives.....21	Livestock.....23	Small business.....25
Corn.....20	Meat inspection.....23	Statehood.....4
Credit policies.....1	Personnel.....2,24	Taxation.....15,18,21
Electrification.....19	Plant research.....13	Territories.....6
Expenditures.....16	Postal rates.....22	Timber.....8
Farm prices.....20	Potatoes.....26	Trade, foreign.....5
Flood control.....8	Poultry.....23	Transportation.....18
Food distribution.....3	Public debt.....28	Water.....7,8
Foreign aid.....11	Public works.....8	Watershed.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House rejected resolution for investigation of monetary and credit policies.

HOUSE

1. CREDIT POLICIES. Rejected, 225 to 174, H. Res. 85, to authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to investigate national monetary and credit policies. pp. 4019-34
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 4034-46). Agreed to amendments by Rep. Flynt to reduce the amount for unemployment compensation payments for Federal employees from \$26,500,000 to \$25,000,000 (pp. 4040-41); and by Rep. Andersen, 104 to 30, to reduce the amount for salaries and expenses for the Mexican farm labor program from \$2,500,000 to \$2,236,200 (pp. 4041-46). Rejected an amendment by Rep. Coad to strike out the \$2,500,000 for the Mexican farm labor program (pp. 4043-46). A point of order was sustained against an amendment by Rep. Colmer to provide that farmers using Mexican farm labor would reimburse the Treasury for such labor (p. 4045).
3. FOOD DISTRIBUTION. Received from the D. C. Commissioners a proposed bill to amend the D. C. Public School Food Services Act; to District of Columbia Committee. p. 4049

4. STATEHOOD. Received a Colo. Legislature memorial favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. p. 4050

SENATE

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Both Houses received a report from the U. S. Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade agreements program for fiscal 1956. pp. 3937, 4049

6. TERRITORIES. Both Houses received the Interior Department's report of laws enacted by the Virgin Islands Legislature in 1956. pp. 3937-8, 4049

7. WATER RESOURCES. Received a N. D. Legislature resolution favoring early construction of the Pipestem Creek dam. p. 3938

Received a N. D. Legislature resolution favoring early construction of the Pembina River dam and irrigation project. p. 3938

8. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Morse opposed the inclusion of Bruce Eddy dam in S. 497, the omnibus public works bill, on the grounds that it threatens "irreplaceable conservation values," and urged a more comprehensive view of river basin development. He inserted eight telegrams he had received in support of its deletion from the omnibus bill. pp. 4017-18

Sen. Johnson stated he hoped action would be taken on S. 497, the omnibus public works bill, on Thurs., Mar. 28 (p. 4008). Sen. Chavez inserted a chart showing the categories of expenditures in S. 497, and urged that it was "urgently needed." Sen. Kerr pointed to the rapid increase in per capita water requirements and urged conservation of water through development of the projects proposed. Sen. Kerr explained the provisions for water supply storage in all reservoirs, in reply to a question by Sen. Johnson. pp. 4010-13

Sen. Morse urged authorization of the Yaquina Bay and Harbor project, as "this bill will enable physical improvements of tremendous value to the lumber and timber industry." p. 4018

9. GRAZING LANDS. Sen. Anderson inserted a N. Mex. Legislature resolution urging the grant of the Fort Stanton Reservation to N. Mex. to provide more grazing land in the state. pp. 3938-9

10. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 42, authorizing construction of the San Angelo, Tex., reclamation project (S. Rept. 193). p. 3939

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. J. Res. 39, authorizing an irrigation project for the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. (S. Rept. 192). p. 3939

11. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Wiley urged promotion of free world prosperity through encouraging the flow of U. S. private capital abroad, and inserted a statement and an article on foreign investment. pp. 3945-8

12. BUDGET. Sen. Byrd pointed to unexpended balances of appropriations and authorizations, which could be used "to continue the rate of annual expenditures without reduction," and urged the President to respond to "the grass-roots movement for more economical Federal Government," by presenting a revised budget showing where cuts can be made. In reply to Sen. Mansfield Sen. Byrd agreed that the executive had greater power and ability to cut the budget than Congress. Sen. Lausche discussed Federal grants to the States, and Sen. Byrd noted that the Budget called for "67 Federal Grants to States,

wanted a full and complete investigation by a cross section of the people of the country. "What better cross section," I said to them, "could you have than the people in the House of Representatives who were commissioned by their people to speak for them?"

They come from every section, every quarter of the United States. They have to be elected. They are not appointed by anybody. A governor of a State can appoint a Senator, but he cannot appoint a Member of the House of Representatives. That keeps the House of Representatives, its membership, and its committees closer to the people than is the case with any other group of people in the United States.

I do not want the House of Representatives to abdicate its power and its authority to do such things as this. You talk about a bipartisan commission or a nonpartisan commission. Those words just float around here all the time and have been for the last 4 years, to my certain knowledge—bipartisanship, non-partisanship.

I find that a great many people want nonpartisanship when they want something and they want partisanship when they do not want something.

Why should not this great Committee on Banking and Currency be given the same power and the same authority, under the leadership of the great gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to do what every other major committee in the House of Representatives has been authorized to do by your vote? What is wrong with the Committee on Banking and Currency? Do not you Republican Members have faith that you can help control that committee? Do you not know that when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] appoints a subcommittee, he appoints some of you on it? You will have a voice there.

You go off here and have one of these commissions. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] says we have had many of them. Well, I have seen a great many of them, and after they are through, they have to come back to the membership of the House of Representatives and these committees, which have to do the work. None of them will take the word only of a commission. They go into hearings, just as this committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and others, would go into these matters initially and make their report to the House of Representatives.

What is wrong with that? Have we no faith in ourselves? Eight appointed by the President of the United States; 2 suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], 2 by myself, 2 by the majority leader in the Senate, and 2 by the minority leader.

Well, the way I think that stacks up, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, is that it would mean 12 Republicans and 4 Democrats. That is exactly how bipartisan that would be, or rather, if you please, nonpartisan.

So I ask you today, let us go along with this resolution. Let us not listen to these outside forces. Let us do our own busi-

ness in our own way, we who have been elected by the vote, the faith, and confidence of the American people.

I trust that you will not be voting in panic, but that you will vote in reason and adopt House Resolution 85.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 225, answered "present" 2, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—174

Addonizio	Gathings
Albert	Gordon
Anfuso	Granahan
Ashley	Gray
Bailey	Griffiths
Baring	Hagen
Barrett	Hardy
Beckworth	Harris
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Va.
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.
Boggs	Hays, Ohio
Boland	Healey
Bolling	Holifield
Bonner	Holland
Boyle	Huddleston
Breeding	Hull
Brooks, La.	Ikard
Brooks, Tex.	Jennings
Brown, Ga.	Johnson
Brown, Mo.	Jones, Ala.
Burdick	Karsten
Burleson	Kee
Byrd	Kelley, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Kelly, N. Y.
Cannon	Keogh
Carnahan	Kilday
Celler	Kingore
Chelf	King
Christopher	Kirwan
Chudoff	Kluczynski
Clark	Knutson
Coad	Lane
Coffin	Lanham
Cooper	Lankford
Dawson, Ill.	Lennon
Delaney	Lesinski
Denton	Long
Dingell	Loser
Dollinger	McCarthy
Donohue	McCormack
Dowdy	McFall
Eberhart	McGovern
Edmondson	Macdonald
Elliott	Machrowicz
Engle	Mack, Ill.
Evins	Madden
Fallon	Magnuson
Farbstein	Mahon
Fascell	Marshall
Feighan	Matthews
Fino	Metcalf
Flood	Miller, Calif.
Fogarty	Mills
Forand	Morgan
Fountain	Morris
Frazier	Moss
Friedel	Moulder
Garmatz	Multer

NAYS—225

Abbitt	Avery	Berry
Abernethy	Ayres	Betts
Adair	Baker	Blich
Alexander	Baldwin	Bolton
Alger	Barden	Bosch
Allen, Calif.	Bass, Tenn.	Bow
Allen, Ill.	Bates	Bray
Andersen,	Baumhart	Broomfield
H. Carl	Beamer	Brown, Ohio
Andrews	Becker	Brownson
Arends	Belcher	Broyhill
Ashmore	Bennett, Mich.	Budge
Auchincloss	Bentley	Bush

Byrne, Ill.	Holmes	Radwan
Byrnes, Wis.	Holt	Ray
Canfield	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Carrigg	Hosmer	Reed
Cederberg	Hyde	Rees, Kans.
Chamberlain	James	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chenoweth	Jarman	Riehlman
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Riley
Church	Jensen	Rivers
Clevenger	Johansen	Robeson, Va.
Cole	Jonas	Robson, Ky.
Collier	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Corbett	Kearney	Sadlak
Coudert	Kearns	St. George
Cretella	Keating	Saylor
Cunningham,	Keeney	Schenck
Iowa	Kilburn	Schwengel
Cunningham,	Kitchin	Scott, N. C.
Nebr.	Knox	Scott, Pa.
Curtin	Krueger	Scrivner
Curtis, Mass.	Laford	Scudder
Curtis, Mo.	Landrum	Seely-Brown
Dague	Latham	Sheehan
Davis, Ga.	LeCompte	Sikes
Dawson, Utah	Lipscomb	Siler
Dellay	McConnell	Simpson, Ill.
Dempsey	McCulloch	Simpson, Pa.
Dennison	McDonough	Smith, Calif.
Derounjan	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Devereux	McIntire	Smith, Va.
Dixon	McIntosh	Smith, Wis.
Dooley	McVey	Springer
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Wash.	Stauffer
Dorn, S. C.	Mailliard	Taber
Dwyer	Martin	Talle
Fenton	Mason	Taylor
Flynt	May	Teague, Calif.
Ford	Meador	Tewes
Forrester	Merrow	Thomas
Fulton	Michel	Thomson, Wyo.
Gary	Miller, Md.	Tollefson
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Tuck
George	Miller, N. Y.	Utt
Griffin	Minshall	Van Pelt
Gross	Moore	Van Zandt
Gubser	Morano	Vinson
Hale	Mumma	Vorys
Haley	Murray	Vursell
Halleck	Neal	Wainwright
Harden	Nicholson	Walter
Harrison, Nebr.	Nimtz	Weaver
Harvey	Norblad	Westland
Haskell	Norrell	Wharton
Hébert	O'Brien, N. Y.	Widnall
Hemphill	O'Hara, Minn.	Wigglesworth
Herlong	Osmers	Williams, Miss.
Heseltan	Ostertag	Wilson, Calif.
Hess	Patterson	Wilson, Ind.
Hiestand	Pelly	Winstead
Hill	Pillion	Withrow
Hoeven	Poff	Wolverton
Hoffman	Prouty	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Fisher O'Konski

NOT VOTING 31

Anderson,	Davis, Tenn.	Henderson
Mont.	Dies	Hillings
Andresen,	Diggs	Holtzman
August H.	Doyle	Jackson
Aspinall	Durham	Jones, Mo.
Bass, N. H.	Frelinghuysen	McMillan
Bowler	Grant	Morrison
Boykin	Green, Oreg.	Poage
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Scherer
Cooley	Gregory	Sheppard
Cramer	Gwinn	Williams, N. Y.

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire against.
 Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Gregory against.
 Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Jackson against.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
 Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Henderson against.
 Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Scherer against.
 Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Cramer against.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.
 Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Hillings against.
 Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.

Mr. Bowler for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. HALEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live paid with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purpose.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 24, page 4, of the bill. If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce that we are going to continue on today, by agreement reached between the ranking minority member the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself, until 5 o'clock and then rise and try to complete the bill on tomorrow. We are not quite half way through the Department of Labor, and there are several amendments pending on the desk as far as that Department is concerned that may take up most of the time between now and 5 o'clock.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$6 million, of which \$1,125,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 5, line 8, strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$5,558,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment along the line of what we were seeking to do on yesterday when the Committee rose, and that is to reduce this bill to the level of last year. As I said on yesterday, in this age, when the country is demanding a reduction in taxes and a lowering of appropriations, it seems to me it is very little to ask all these bureaus and agencies that they stick with their appropriations of last year and try to tighten up their expenses and find places, of which there are many to economize, so that they can cooperate with the Congress and live within the budget that they had last year.

Now, that is all this amendment does, is to reduce this back to what they had a year ago, and it will reduce this bill by the sum of \$442,000. I do not wish to take the time of the House to discuss it further. That is all it does, and I am just asking you to cut it back to last year.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Virginia has just said is not quite right. He goes back to last year's figure of \$5,558,000, but he does not take into consideration that because of the action of this House last year we are forcing the Bureau of Employment Security to accept the additional responsibilities of mandatory increases that amount to \$323,600. So what the gentleman's amendment means is that we would not be going back to last year's figures; but he is asking you to accept a budget cut of \$323,000 below the amount they had in this fiscal year. That will mean a reduction in personnel of whatever number of persons that amount of money would employ.

As far as saving money to the taxpayers is concerned, this amendment would not save one dime. The amendment, if passed, would not cut one nickel out of this appropriation, because the money does not come out of the Federal Treasury at all. These funds come into the Federal Treasury by the payment of unemployment taxes by the employer. The administrative expenses that we are talking about now are paid out of a levy of three-tenths of 1 percent which is collected and used for administering the unemployment compensation fund in our country.

We have, through our actions in the past few years, given this Bureau a 30 percent increase in work load in the last 8 years and during that same time we have cut the staff by 7 percent. Think of it! In the last 8 years we have asked this Bureau by legislative action by your votes to assume a 30 percent increase in

workload and we have cut their staff by 7 percent, even though this money does not come out of the Federal Treasury at all but is money paid in by the employer. They have the responsibility of administering one of the largest programs in our Government. If you want them to administer it fairly and squarely and honestly there is only one thing you can do, and that is to go along with the committee's recommendation.

As far as their operations are concerned, his is the only division in the Department of Labor that is doing anything to hire handicapped workers, or doing something about the employment of the more mature workers in our country. If you want to handicap them in that work and prevent them from carrying out those programs then you should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

We on the committee have presented to you our best judgment. This is the lowest possible figure with which we think they can efficiently operate this division.

Let me make one point again. If you vote for this amendment, you are not voting to cut one dime out of the Federal budget because these funds do not come through taxation, they do not come out of the Federal Treasury. Let us not kid ourselves in that respect. This is one of the best programs we have in the Department of Labor. Every State Director of Employment Security in our country, bar none, would be against this proposed cut.

I hope, because of the universal approval of the operation of this division over the years, that the amendment will be voted down; because, if there is an actual case of false economy that is being attempted to be put over here, this amendment is it.

I was just reading the headlines in today's paper, referring to what happened yesterday here in the House, and the cuts that were made by the House, with 99 percent of the Republicans voting for them. This is the headline: "Ike Vehemently Slaps Piecemeal Budget Cut as Fatuous and Foolish."

I did not know exactly what the word "fatuous" meant until at lunchtime the distinguished lady from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] informed me as to its meaning. As I remember, it means something like irresponsible or foolish.

It seems to me that you are deserting the President and his leadership, and his Cabinet in the budget that you have before you today or else he is deserting you. Your actions today indicate to me you have gotten tired of his leadership. It may be that because he is not going to be a candidate 4 years from now you have decided to take over the leadership from your President. It seems to me that it sounds something like that. If the President is quoted correctly, he has said that this is a foolish way to cut the budget. A little gratuitous advice is you ought to listen to your President, because he was the only one who could win on your ticket last year.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and, the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 105, noes 97.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 126, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have for some days been conducting hearings regarding Alaskan statehood before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A lot of the opposition to statehood for Alaska has been based on the charge that the Legislature of Alaska has acted immaturity and irresponsibly and that they have not followed sound and good government policies. Well, after having observed what happened here yesterday and what apparently is now starting here today, I just wonder what right some of us have, as Members of the Congress of the United States which, certainly, I agree with the Speaker is the greatest legislative body in the world—but what right do we have to charge anybody—anybody—with a lack of responsibility or a lack of judgment?

I want to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I think he has been doing an outstanding job here. I could not help but admire him for his courage and for his devotion to the American people to get up here time after time after time and defend the administration's budget against irresponsible actions by members of the President's own party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I demand that the words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. What is the gentleman's point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The statement of the gentleman. He continued to talk after I made my point of order. The point of order is made against the words he used with reference to irresponsibility in voting as we did. That is a charge that we are irresponsible as Members of the House and I say it is a violation of the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making a point of order or demanding that the words be taken down?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I made the point of order in order to gain the floor. Then I asked that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

I could not help but admire him for his courage and for his devotion to the American people to get up here time after time after time to defend the administration's budget against irresponsible actions by members of the President's own party.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

I could not help but admire him for his courage and for his devotion to the American people to get up here time after time after time to defend the administration's budget against irresponsible actions by members of the President's own party.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot see in those words any reflection on the character of any gentleman of the House. The Chair also fears that if it should get to the point where one could not criticize somebody's action or vote that it would be pretty hard to carry on debate in the House.

The Chair holds that the words are not a violation of the rules of the House.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that we are responsible, or certainly should be, as representatives of the American people to try to develop and to support in an orderly manner a budget which the various executive departments of the Government can live with. Last year and the year before we heard Members time after time voice their concern over injustice, and I believe they are still just as concerned.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

We are still just as concerned about the human welfare of the American people as we were last year and the year before. My only purpose in taking the floor was to urge that we support the members of this committee, men who have demonstrated a genuine concern not only for economic responsibility, but also a concern for the departments of Government which operate under this budget. Certainly, as I said a little bit ago, I admire the courage and the devotion to duty and to the American people of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for coming down to this well time after time and making a fight which begins to look hopeless.

It would be my hope, certainly, that we as Members of Congress would be willing to stand up with a little stiffer backbone. I just wonder how much politics there is in this or how many votes you think you are gaining by cutting \$20,000 or \$5,000 in many cases out of matters that do not even concern taxation, which happens to be the case in the last vote, as stated by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that it did not affect taxes one iota. That is what happens when we get involved in a situation that in making a few grandstand plays we get up and start trying to cut a little nibble here and a little nibble there.

It would be my hope that we can proceed to pass this appropriation bill and to give to the various executive departments of the Government concerned an opportunity to carry on and to conduct the affairs of their departments in order. Over \$100 million has been cut out of this budget and I think an excellent job has been done by the subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in this debate we have a situation where it now appears to be in order for the Members on one side or the other to accuse those who oppose their views or cast their votes in opposition of being irresponsible.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman criticizing the decision of the Chair on the recent demand that words be taken down?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I accept it. I am only trying to show it is in error and the situation is just as described.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand the words be taken down.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order and I want to be heard.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request, but I think the speaker should be directed to talk on his preferential motion. Anything he has said up to now is a wide, sweeping departure from the way he got the time on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the bill under consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what I am trying to do, Mr. Chairman. I am trying to show the fallacy that exists, not of irresponsible Members on either side, because this is not a party or political issue but of trying to write an appropriation bill as we are doing here today.

I just want to show the state we are in, more accurately the condition of mind. Of course, I have respect for the Speaker, respect his decisions, but that does not foreclose my right to give my views on what it is my privilege to anticipate the civil-rights bill, invoke the first not the fifth amendment.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, getting back to where we started, of course, our debate should be constructive. Perhaps I am the worst offender of any Member of the House, and I only regret that when you gentlemen try to follow you do not give me an example of how I should proceed.

Now, here we are, getting back, if it is all right to say, and I assume it is, that the votes over there in opposition to something that we advocate over here are wrong. Apparently it is within the rules for me to characterize those so voting as irresponsible—that I will not. Irresponsible means among other things, free from or incapable of incurring responsibility, not able to answer for consequences, not able to render satisfaction, one not responsible for his actions, indicating a lack of mental or physical capacity to perform one's duty. Some and the Democratic side had the courage and the intelligence, let us say, to vote earlier today contrary to what apparently our leadership wanted. A majority of around 50 decided they did not wholly agree with the Speaker's views—can they be—is it proper to say they are irresponsible. That vote would be a good example, if I may suggest it where those on the majority side, if you have independent views—and I assume that you have, and so vote—it would be proper to say in debate that you are not responsible legislators.

I made the point in good faith, because the rules should be established and followed. Because if the personal element is injected debate becomes less helpful. I know there are some who came here recently who will be glad to know how far they can go in questioning the ability, the integrity, the sincerity of their Members who disagree with their political conclusions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will try to comply with the ruling. Am just attempting to show that a charge of irresponsibility does not convey information.

The gentleman said that this last amendment had nothing to do with the taxes imposed upon the people. This is an appropriation bill. Money is what we are talking about, is it not—appropriations that eventually will have to be met by taxation? If an appropriation is cut—does it not follow that if the program is continued other dollars must come from someplace to replace those taken out. This motion of mine was offered in good faith, with the idea that as long as we are getting around to where we question each other's ability, motives, or intelligence as Congressmen, and each other's responsibility and the way in

which we proceed, that it might be well if we go over until tomorrow and cool off—give a little consideration to what we are doing. I admire the ability of the gentleman who has charge of this bill [Mr. FOGARTY], his courage, and the way in which he has presented the issues. No one can criticize him for the presentation of his views. But he called attention to some statement which it is reported our President made. I do not have it before me. Permit me to repeat again that apparently Members on both sides are trying to go along with the demand of their constituents that we cut the budget. That is what we are trying to do. Can we not assume from here on that all of us are acting in good faith? Can we not forget this tin-cup business of yesterday when we were accused by inference at least of trying to rob the blind man?

I will not go any further. You get my suggestion. It is that some time after all the amendments have been adopted we send the bill back to committee, which by that time will know the will of the House—report it back with substantial cuts—which will give you at least some further reduction and yet not kill all of the programs for which so many have voted but all of which cannot be carried on at an ever-increasing rate until the citizen's burden is beyond his strength to carry—his ability to meet.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that during the rest of today and tomorrow and Friday, or whatever time it takes to finish this bill, you remain, because I think we ought to put the membership on record now that, if sufficient amendments are carried, there are going to be 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, or 14 rollcalls and record votes when we complete the reading of this bill. I want also to remind you again that the two words that I remember from today's headline, because the reporter has taken it from me, were to the effect that the President said at his conference this morning that all reasonable attempts to cut these budget figures of his, his budget and his Cabinet, your leaders, are fatuous. I do not know who those remarks are directed to. You must decide that for yourself, but those are the quotes from your leader.

I remember distinctly the first year that I appeared in the well of this House defending appropriation bills for the Department of Labor was in 1947. You remember the election of 1946 when the Republicans swept the country, elected a Republican House and a Republican Senate. You also remember that in the campaign in 1946 they were going up and down and across the country promising the working people of our country that if they were elected, the friends of the workers and the workers of our country would be fairly treated. Yet you must recall that the first thing you did was to enact the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. And then when this appropriation bill came before you, you cut it 25 percent in 1947. We Democrats made a pretty good record in 1947 on the floor of this House in fighting those amendments. And then in 1948 you helped to cut it another 20 per-

cent over 1947. So, you made a splendid record in that 80th Congress in cutting appropriations for the Department of Labor. But, what happened in the election of 1948? Because of your help in cutting these appropriations to such an extent, especially in the Department of Labor, and taking away the rights and privileges that the Department extended to the working people of this country by denying them the enforcement of these laws, the people reacted in the fall of 1948 and you woke on the day after election the most amazed persons on this earth, because nobody believed at that time that a Democrat could win the Presidency of the United States as Harry Truman did in 1948.

I want to congratulate you now, because the same combination that was working in that 80th Congress in 1947 and 1948 is again in effect yesterday and today and tomorrow. The same leaders are leading the same fight, and I hope that you have the same success and I hope and pray that your success in cutting these appropriations will guarantee that a Democrat will be elected to the White House 4 years from now.

The American people have shown before that they cannot be fooled for long. I am completely confident that they will see through the strategy of reactionary Republicanism that strips them of their hard-won rights and privileges in the guise of economy. They will demonstrate at the polls, as they have before, that it is more important to maintain decent standards of living for the mass of our population than it is to reduce the taxes of one big corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion.

The preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out yesterday, our situation in the United States has worsened in the progress toward a balanced budget to the tune of \$2,594,000,000 since the first of the year. The only way we can take care of our people, the only way we can take care of our defense, is by saving money wherever it can be saved and by doing it diligently and properly. For my own part, I have voted for no amendment that I thought would cripple any organization of the Government. I know the conditions of our public payroll. It is so stuffed and so elaborate that it needs to be trimmed down. The only way savings can be made are in the appropriation bills that come up. We must go through them all the way down the line and see that no more is provided in those bills than really is needed to carry on the functions that those departments and agencies have to perform.

I know nothing about the political effect of these cuts. Frankly, I do not believe that any economies that this Congress made in 1947 or in 1953 or 1954 had the slightest to do with the elections in the years following. I do not believe those those votes were a repudiation of the honest effort that was made in the 80th Congress to put the Government of the United States on an honest basis. I believe those Members of Congress who

went out and fought on those lines succeeded. I believe they will succeed again if we make an honest effort to approach this problem.

I am not going to change my position. If a thing is right I am going to vote for it. If it is wrong I am going to vote against it. I hope that the House of Representatives will have the courage to do likewise.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment, and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses including purchasing and installing of air-conditioning equipment in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684) and title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1130), \$262 million, of which \$12 million shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning after the first figure in line 5, with the words "of which" down to the word "adjustments", in line 15, as legislation upon an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do, Mr. Chairman. This language has been carried in the

bill for about 10 years, I think. It was first put in, I believe, under the leadership of Mr. Keefe when he was chairman of this subcommittee because we thought it was in the form of a limitation on an appropriation bill and would discourage supplementals and deficiencies that had previously occurred. This \$12 million was set aside for the specific reason of taking care of unseen workloads that developed during the year and increased State salaries which by law we are bound to provide when the States increase salaries. So, in order to provide a fund like this that would prevent them from coming back with supplementals each year we agreed on this language. It was the intention of the committee to be a limitation upon an appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add to my point of order that it requires additional duties of the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the words referred to, beginning in line 5 and ending in line 15, are legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has studied the legislation and finds in agreement with the statement of the gentleman from New York that additional duties are imposed upon the Secretary, as shown in line 6, which reads, "that the Secretary finds necessary," and so forth. Therefore, the Chair must uphold the point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this to make an inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee. I wonder if the gentleman Rhode Island would refer to the hearings for the Department of Labor, on page 29. At the bottom of the page he will note that there is a colloquy between himself and Secretary Mitchell and Mr. Dodson with reference to the funds that they requested of the Bureau of the Budget, and the amounts that were allowed by the Bureau of the Budget and incorporated in the budget sent to Congress. There is some language in this table submitted which I do not understand. In one column appears the words "Congressional estimate." That is a new phrase, as far as I can determine, in connection with any budget operation.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was new to us, too. This is rather unusual terminology.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not criticizing the committee, I am trying to figure out what these two columns mean. I am inclined to the belief, and I would like to have the gentleman from Rhode Island tell me whether I am right or wrong, that the figures under "Congressional estimate" would apparently be the request made to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget, whereas in the column headed "Budget Bureau estimate" are the requests for funds that were made to the Bureau of the Budget. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would gather, then, that the Bureau of the Budget increased the amount after the

heading "New Applications" by \$24,900 above what the Bureau requested?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Bureau of the Budget also increased non-personal services by \$161,200?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right, but they did decrease the entire amount of this program by \$253,000, and that is what I find fault with.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I appreciate that fact, but in view of the fact that we do have an allowance by the Bureau of the Budget over and above what the Bureau requested for these two particular phases, I offer an amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. I may have misunderstood the gentleman. Maybe I did not give him the correct answer. This congressional estimate is the request contained in the President's budget. We have not gone over the Bureau of the Budget figures.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We still may not understand each other. In this total at the bottom of page 29 there are numerous breakdowns of the total figure which was apparently requested by the Department of Labor of the Bureau of the Budget. Their total in that column would be \$18,671,000. That was the total requested of the Bureau of the Budget by the Department of Labor for this particular area.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But that is further broken down into specific amounts. It is true that the overall figure was cut. The Bureau of the Budget cut some of the items that make up the overall \$18,671,000, but in 2 categories that also make up that total they increased the amount the Bureau requested. It just seems to me that it is inadvisable to appropriate on the basis of an increase by the Bureau of the Budget over and above what the Department of Labor itself requested to carry out certain specific functions. That is why I submit this amendment which is simply to reduce your overall figure of \$261,814,000 that is found on line 5 by the amount of \$186,000. One hundred and eighty-six thousand dollars is the total of the two increases made by the Bureau of the Budget in sending the request to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: On page 6, line 5, strike out "\$262,000,000" and insert "\$261,814,000."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think I have explained the purpose of the amendment and the reference to it in the hearings.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot argue too much with the gentleman's contentions, and I accept the amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: On page 6, line 5,

strike out "\$262,000,000" and insert "\$250,000,000."

(Mr. BURLESON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] why, since the language on page 6, lines 5 through 14, and the word "adjustments" on line 15, was ruled to be not in order, why his amendment did not include the entire \$12 million.

As I read the message of the Bureau of the Budget on this item, they said this: "The purpose of the \$12 million" is "to primarily increase tax and auditing workloads, increase placement and counsel services," and so forth. Then further: "The efforts for better management of State agencies, development of employment and unemployment facts, and increases in average annual salaries."

It just seems to me that since the appropriation for fiscal year 1955-56 and fiscal year 1956-57 was for the sum of \$250 million that they could get by with the same amount for this fiscal year. This \$12 million is a speculative figure. They do not know how much it is going to cost. But they are speculating on what State laws may be passed which would affect unemployment insurance, and so forth. So, it seems to me that this is certainly a place where we could wait and see what the cost is. There is nothing to lose. It will not impair services. I must admit I am not very familiar with all the details as to what this service is and what it does. But it is obvious that no service is going to be impaired. No service is going to be lessened in any way, and if they could take what they have had for this year it seems we are not being fatuous in this instance. Incidentally, I want to say to my good friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] I appreciate very much what he said yesterday regarding authorizations which must be paid for in the future. I shall refer to this further in a moment. If it is fatuous and foolish to try to reduce this budget, then give me some of it because—well, I just saw the figures on my own income tax. I can do a lot of crabbing about it, too. We are getting enough letters about it from our people back home. I just saw my figures this morning, and I have a great inspiration to say what I am saying today. My State legislature memorialized the Congress the other day, and I appreciate very much the sentiment expressed in the resolution which called for economy in Federal spending. They memorialized Congress to reduce expenditures, to reduce the budget. At the proper time I shall ask this resolution by the Texas Legislature be placed in the RECORD.

Now, this is a grant to the States. Later on I expect to introduce other amendments which will reduce these grants-in-aid to States. We have an opportunity now. We have the people behind us. The key to this whole thing was expressed in the President's budget message when he said that "as long as the people demanded the kind of services called for in this budget, which services they deserve, it is necessary to spend this

kind of money." The key is there. As long as the people "demand these services," and the President added "which they deserve," it is necessary to spend this sort of money. Yet they write us and tell us to reduce the budget. All right. Let us do it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There has been a threat on foot of having a record vote on cutting expenditures. There are some of us in the House of Representatives who are proud when we can vote to reduce expenditures, and we want our people to know that we are willing to economize and save the credit of the Government.

Mr. BURLESON. I appreciate what the gentleman has to say. I had a letter only yesterday from a man who said, "Unless you believe in wrecking the economy of the country, then let us cut down on the expenditures of Government."

I wrote back and said, "It is something like being against crime and sin. Everyone is against it." Everyone is for reducing the budget but it is usually economy for the other man. I am for economy in Idaho and perhaps in Maine and a considerable amount down in Oklahoma. But I get a little weaker when it gets down into Texas. Then in the districts of some of my colleagues I am for economy over there, unless it would injure and hurt my colleague, but when you come into my district I am for economy, "but." And so it goes and we all know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia) Mr. BURLESON was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wanted to interrupt the gentleman but he was preaching such a good sermon on my doctrine that I did not interrupt him. I wanted to get straightened out on the parliamentary situation. The gentleman who preceded you offered an amendment. Is your amendment offered in the nature of a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. So that your amendment is a substitute. As I understand, this is the situation: The point of order raised by the gentleman from New York knocked out the clause which carried \$12 million. So if you do not pass the Burleson amendment, you have stricken it out on a point of order, but you have appropriated \$12 million. You have to adopt the Burleson substitute in order to make effective the point of order made by the gentleman from New York. I hope the House will understand that and vote that way. I hope the gentleman will now proceed. It still leaves equal to what they had last year?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct and I appreciate the gentleman's assistance in clarifying the situation. As I under-

stand the language subsequent to the figure of \$12 million, and the \$12 million is included in the figure of \$262 million in the bill, was not stricken, but it only permits that the \$12 million may be used for a contingent purpose. I am emphasizing the words "contingent purpose," out of the \$262 million. If that is not correct, I stand corrected. It being purely speculation as to whether or not it will be needed, here is an opportunity to save a little money, and \$12 million is not such a small amount.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. NEAL. I take it for granted that the gentleman does not believe it is good to appropriate money for folks to play with.

Mr. BURLESON. I certainly do not. I do not believe that all appropriations for grants in aid to States is bad. I think there are some things which a State cannot always do, but if I must cite an example, I would say that the most flagrant imaginative proposition of that kind would be Federal aid to education. I just give that as an example. But as the gentleman from Rhode Island said here yesterday—he spoke a truth—we authorize these projects which extend far into the future. That is where we are being fatuous, that is where we are being foolish, in my opinion.

I plead not guilty to some of these issues which the gentleman so ably described yesterday, but I believe in placing the guilt where it belongs, and that is on this body and on the other body, on all of us, in authorizing projects, in buying something on the installment plan which we must pay for when the evil day comes and this is one of those many days.

As I read the budget there are \$23 billion in it over which Congress has no control; no more control than we have over the \$7 billion interest on the public debt.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman mentioned Federal grants-in-aid for schools and classroom construction. I would like to ask the gentleman if there are not some school districts in his congressional district that get grants-in-aid under Public Law 815?

Mr. BURLESON. Is that the Smith-Hughes Act?

Mr. BAILEY. No; it is not the Smith-Hughes Act.

Mr. BURLESON. Tell me what it is; I am not familiar with it by number.

Mr. BAILEY. It is the act requiring the Federal Government to meet its responsibility to school districts.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman means "impacted-area" funds?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. Would the gentleman object to taking that money?

Mr. BURLESON. I voted against it. I am not guilty of that, and I have some of that construction in my congressional district. The same is true of public housing.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman does not object to those funds going to Texas, does he?

Mr. BURLESON. I said earlier that I, like everyone else, was more for economy in some other part of the country when it comes to Federal-funds handout, but I am not guilty of voting for many of the measures mentioned by my good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], which must be paid for in the future.

I make no claim to great political courage by my record here will show I have not voted for these costly programs, as desirable as many of them may be and the record will further show that my record in this respect is consistent with my votes against more than \$10 billion in appropriations last year.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will support the cut of \$12 million from this bill as I here propose by my amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the comments made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]. I wish to associate myself with them. It may come as a surprise to you but I think all of you should know that while the last session of Congress was reducing the President's requests for appropriation by \$257 million, it was at the same time—in other than appropriation bills—increasing the President's requests for other types of obligating and spending authority about \$1,736 million. This type of authority results in expenditures from the Treasury just as expenditures from appropriations. There is no difference in the end result. The place and time to start economizing is right here on this floor when authorization bills are up for consideration and decision.

I voted for the resolution this House passed recently, inviting the President to suggest where budget cuts might be made. I did it despite the fact that I believed the resolution was at least in part politically inspired and was designed to put the President of the United States more or less on the spot; but I was unwilling to cast any vote in this House that could be construed as opposed to economy. I do not care whether the initiative for economy comes from the Executive or whether it originates in the House of Representatives, I am for it. Also, I might add, who gets the credit is immaterial; getting the job done is the important thing.

So long as I remain a Member of the House, I shall support every reasonable effort to bring Government spending under control. I believe that the greatest need facing our country on the domestic front is to get our financial house in order. I believe it is just as important to do that today as it was in 1953 when I helped cut the last budget submitted by former President Truman by more than \$10 billion. I am willing to help cut this last budget by as much as it can be cut reasonably and without using a meat ax approach.

While I am on my feet, and with some reluctance, because I happen to admire the gentleman from Rhode Island, and appreciate the hard work he has done as

a member of this committee, I would like to say that I cannot allow the implications in his remarks to go unanswered. So far as I am concerned, and I do not pretend to be any better than other Members of this body. I want everyone to know that I do not cast votes here on appropriation measures on the basis of whether such votes will gain me support in the next election. The suggestion that we should vote here today with one eye on how that vote may affect our reelection chances in 1958 was unworthy of the gentleman who made it, and I specifically reject it.

When the time comes that we all put the welfare of the country above partisan or political advantage, we will put our Government's financial house in order; and I mean by that to refuse to appropriate more money than we take in any year unless confronted with a grave national emergency; to balance the budget and keep it balanced; to begin making substantial reductions in the national debt; and get our country's finances in such condition that we can provide some much-needed tax relief.

This is an issue that is above politics. Let us forget politics once and get on with the job of reducing Government spending, and let us do it in such substantial fashion that the entire country will notice it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin to the substitute offered by Mr. BURLESON: Strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert "\$249,814,000."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to combine the amendment I previously offered to provide a reduction of \$186,000 with the \$12 million cut proposed by the gentleman from Texas. This simply combines the two. If the \$12 million substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] is adopted without this amendment, then the further reduction of \$186,000 would be impossible. So my amendment combines the two.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], I am not trying to find fault with anybody who is trying to cut this budget today. The facts that I related about the 80th Congress were just facts. I related what happened in the 80th Congress and what were the results and I believe because that happened then it can happen again. You not only lost the presidency of the United States at that time, which was right in the palm of your hand, but you lost both Houses of Congress, too. When you could not carry the Congress last year with your President winning by

one of the largest majorities in history, there must be something wrong with either the Republican leadership in Congress or with the leadership in the White House. I do not know which it is. But you have to make up your own mind as to that.

I also want to commend men like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] because I believe he is sincere and I know that he has voted against many of these authorizations. I find no fault with those who have the courage of their convictions, who stand up on a record vote and are counted in opposition to some of the legislation that was proposed by your President and enacted during the past 2 years. I do not criticize those who have gotten up in the last 2 years and had the courage to vote against those authorizations.

Those men and women who are now getting up on this floor to cut back these appropriations should be commended. But, I do not like the idea of supporting the things that sound good and read good back home on the one hand, just before election, and then after election, on the other hand, come in here and cut, as I said yesterday, the guts out of these appropriations and make the things that you voted for in the past few years inoperable. To me that is what I find fault with.

I also find fault with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] in the plea for economy. Once again I say to you, as I said on the last amendment, this does not save one dime, not one nickel, in the Federal Treasury. It is not a grant to the States in the usual sense. This money is paid in by the employers into a fund and then into the Treasury of the United States. It is their money, not yours or mine. It belongs to these individuals who contribute to the unemployment compensation funds. All we are the custodians of that fund. That is the only control we have over it. It is not a grant to a State or to a community or to anybody else. We are just giving back to these people the administrative funds to run their programs for unemployment compensation. Now, if you do not believe in unemployment compensation, then you ought to come out and say so, because this is all taken out of that fund of three-tenths of 1 percent that is collected and tumbled in to the Treasury and reappropriated to administer the employment services of this country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The fact of the matter is, is it not, that the payments are made out of the Treasury? A tax of a certain amount for administration of unemployment compensation is levied upon the employer, and it is paid in. That is the way it operates.

Mr. FOGARTY. The decision as to what the employer pays is made by the States. It is not made by me or anybody in the Federal Government. That responsibility lies with the States and it

is a complete State operation. And I will say to the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in whom I have a great deal of confidence, that when he struck out the language for the contingency fund on a point of order, that we have had in this bill for about 8 years, he was almost requiring the Department to come back and ask for a supplemental for at least some mandatory increases that are bound to come up. When the States raise the pay of these employees and when increased workloads occur in the States because of some conditions unforeseen when these budgets were made up, we are morally bound to provide the necessary funds, and that is exactly why the \$12 million was put in there. This is not economy; it is false economy. It is not going to save you one dime. It will mean additional expense for processing supplemental requests for funds and in efficient operations at State level because of inadequate funds. Further there has been no evidence coming to the committee of any misuse of the contingency fund and the existence of this fund has proven in actual operations to be a step forward in the financing of the State employment security agencies. You are now taking a step backward.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 102, noes 73.

So the substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Byrnes amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Unemployment compensation for Federal employees: For payments to unemployed Federal employees, either directly or through payments to States, as authorized by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$26,500,000.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLYNT: On page 8, line 24, strike out "\$26,500,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which seeks to bring this section of the bill in line with the 1957 fiscal year appropriation. I read from the report of the committee on page 6:

There was a carryover of funds from 1956 to 1957 of over \$3,000,000.

There is, of course, an estimated trend that there will be an increase. I feel that this estimated trend will not exceed the \$1,500,000 which is left in, over and above the amounts which were required

during fiscal year 1957. We, of course, do not know what the carryover from fiscal 1957 to fiscal 1958 will be.

I have seen nothing in the report, I have seen nothing in the committee hearings which indicates that more than \$25 million which my amendment leaves in will be used. This amendment is offered simply for the sole purpose to make a realistic effort to reconcile 1956, 1957, and 1958 figures bearing in mind the increased trend.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. There is nothing that I can see which provides for an extra day's pay for persons drawing unemployment compensation. I know of no reason why there should be increased retirement benefits for persons drawing unemployment compensation. I hope that we have not yet reached the point where people may retire from being unemployed.

I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not mean one single, solitary thing. I suppose the gentleman who just offered it voted for the bill that authorized this program a couple of years ago. When he voted for it, he voted to pay this compensation to every Federal employee who is discharged from the Federal Service. So his amendment means nothing because these payments are not controllable and we will have to make the appropriation now or later.

We have arrived at the figure in the bill on the best mathematical terms we could, based on the amount that was spent up until February 28. We believe if we have erred we have erred on the low side. By the adoption of this amendment he is only requiring a supplemental appropriation to come forth next fiscal year.

Let us make no mistake about this. This is a phony cut. If you want a real example of a phony cut, this is it, because we have already voted by legislation to make these payments to Federal employees who are severed from the Federal Service. This will just require them to come in and ask for a supplemental appropriation. Who do we think we are kidding on cuts like this?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that an employee who is separated from the Government is entitled to go into the Court of Claims and get the compensation the Congress decided he was entitled to?

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively.

Mr. ROONEY. Is not this in effect only an estimate of the amount of money necessary to keep that procedure going?

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively. It is an estimate, and we cut the estimate that they came up with on the best figures we had available on the amounts that have been paid out. We shaded that just a little bit to be on the conservative side. So any cut below that is really a phony cut, because we are obligated to make these payments, anyway. It does not make any difference whether or not you adopt this amendment, we have to meet our

responsibilities to pay employees who have been discharged.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Is it not true that there was a \$3 million carryover on this provision in fiscal 1956?

Mr. FOGARTY. There was. That was its first year of operation. That year we cut the original estimate by \$7 million, and we did not cut enough. So this year we cut a little more than we thought we should be on the conservative side. So if there is any estimate in this bill, this is one of the most conservative estimates that we have before us, and the figures we have available will show they will spend all of this and perhaps more. Certainly the gentleman's amendment will require a supplemental appropriation before the fiscal year is up.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is not this item in exactly the same category as the \$79 million the committee claimed as a cut?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; it is not.

Mr. JONAS. What is the difference?

Mr. FOGARTY. There is this difference, that when we cut the \$79 million, as explained yesterday, there were recommendations for \$2.5 million for the training program for personnel in the fields of public assistance. There was an item of \$2,080,000 for cooperative research projects in the field of public assistance to get more efficiency in the operation of this program. Because of the prophecies of the gentleman and his leaders that we are going into better times, and because we voted for the social-security amendments a year ago that should take more off the public-assistance rolls, we thought that we could expect that that \$79 million would not be needed.

Mr. JONAS. But that \$79 million alleged cut is simply the substitution of the committee's guess for the Department's guess as to what it would cost; is not that true?

Mr. FOGARTY. On the basis that we would have allowed \$2.5 million for training and \$2,080,000 for cooperative research; but since those have been stricken out by the full committee, that cut may not stand up. If they had not been stricken from the recommendations of the subcommittee, because we allowed the \$2.5 million and the \$2,080,000, I am sure it would be a good figure and would not be in the same category as the amendment we have here. We had firm figures as to how much was expended at the end of February of this year and what the trend is in these expenditures so that we could calculate the cost for the rest of this year and next year. We based it on that mathematical computation, and there is none better.

Mr. JONAS. If the committee is wrong, is it not inviting a similar supplemental request as to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. FOGARTY. The committee thinks that after listening to the hearings

we are in the best position to make an estimate. When you guess that they can get along with \$1,500,000 less, I think that guess is a little bit on the wild side, if I make myself clear.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FLYNT. Is it not true there was a \$3 million carryover from 1956?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. FLYNT. Does not your report also show on the trend of payments that during the past few months they will be slightly lower during the comparable period of last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. FLYNT. And, if so, is not a \$1,500,000 leeway, which my amendment allows, in line with your committee's own report?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; that has all been taken into consideration by the committee already.

Mr. FLYNT. But, it is in the report; is it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me read the report. We have said in our report under the heading "Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees."

The bill includes \$26,500,000, a reduction of \$5,500,000 from the request, and an increase of \$1,500,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. Since there was a carryover of funds from 1956 to 1957 of over \$3 million, the total amount available for 1957 was over \$28 million, thus the amount contained in the bill is a reduction of about \$1,500,000 from the funds estimated to be expended for this purpose during the current fiscal year. As in the case of unemployment compensation for veterans, the amount contained in the bill is based on the trend of payments during the last few months, which have been slightly lower than during the comparable period of last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the act of July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119), as amended, including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, \$2,500,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 9, line 15, strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$2,236,200."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment directly reducing the personnel to the point this particular division had for the fiscal year 1957. I am offering this amendment to reduce this particular item by \$263,000. My friends, that is a lot of money. That is equal to our four good farms like my farm back in the State of Minnesota. I still think \$263,000 is an awful lot of money. This proposed reduction will provide the Mexican farm labor program for the fiscal year 1958 exactly the same amount of money available for fiscal year 1957. To that extent, it is actually no reduction. But, in reality, it is an

effort to hold the line. I have taken into consideration the \$110,300 for contributions to the civil service retirement fund, \$6,300 for the larger payments to departmental working capital funds which I consider necessary, and finally an offset of \$5,400 for nonrecurring items of other contractual services. I reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that the sum I propose will give to this department the very same amount that it has had for this particular fiscal year. I am willing to give them that same amount another year, in spite of the recent crop report from the Department of Agriculture to the effect that a reduction of 12 million acres in the amount of land planted to 59 crops is anticipated this year below last year.

The Department predicts the smallest acreage planted since World War I, and the budget item I propose to cut deals with farm labor brought in from Mexico. We must, for the sake of our national financial stability, bring to a halt wherever possible the ever-increasing demands made for the hundreds of similar agencies in our Government.

They want to go up and up and up—unseasonably up—never down.

Yesterday the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], did a good job in trying to take out of the Labor Department appropriation bill certain unnecessary sums. They were successful in reducing that bill to the extent of slightly more than \$400,000. Personally, I was glad to vote for all of the amendments which were adopted.

I feel certain in my own mind that we will do very little harm to any of our old established agencies or departments by limiting them to approximately the appropriations made available for this present fiscal year. I hope that my amendment to effect a saving of \$263,800 will be accepted. Remember this one little item goes for nothing else but excess personnel. You people want to knock out a few bureaucrats. There are a lot of good bureaucrats, but if you want to lessen their number, please accept this amount.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in January of this year the Labor Department presented some new Mexican housing regulations. They did not consult with Mr. FOGARTY and his committee before publishing them. They did not consult with the Committee on Agriculture which passed the act originally creating the Mexican labor program. They did not consult with the committee that was set up by them—the so-called Users Committee. They issued these regulations solely and exclusively to get more personnel on the payroll. The issuance was timed so that they could subsequently go before the Appropriations Committee and ask for more funds. Farmers swarmed to Washington in protest from over a wide area of the country asking that their representatives help them obtain modifications of the regulations. I want to show you what they had in mind. One of the principal objections to the regulations had to do with square-foot space minimum

requirements. Here is a shotgun house. You have 16 feet this way in length, and you have 10 feet in width. You have 160 square feet in that shotgun house. Before this new regulation went into effect, 25 square feet was the requirement for one man to be housed. In this 10 by 16 shotgun house that is about the size generally of tenant houses over the country, you have three double-decker beds. Six workers have been housed there. That would be 26 square feet per person. Twenty-five square feet was the previous minimum where double bunks were used so you are within the ruling of the Department. Now what have they done? They have come in with a new regulation requiring 34 square feet for 1 man. That will mean that the farmers in the United States that use this labor in some 18 or more States will have to increase the size of their houses to have the same number of workers working for them in the future, by 33½ percent. They have appealed to you to do something to help them so that they would not have to increase the size of these houses. They have asked us for help. We have appealed to the Department of Labor in the most humble terms.

Thirty-four Members of this House signed a letter, and I have it right here, asking that these regulations which would cause these farmers to increase the size of their houses be eliminated and other features be made more reasonable. Do you think they complied with our request? Oh, no. On Monday of this week these housing regulations went into effect. Yes; they get under this appropriation as it is, and it was cut down by the Fogarty committee somewhat, because they asked for some \$500,000, \$375,000 additional for new fieldmen. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota would strike out the 35 additional compliance fieldmen to be used largely to enforce these new regulations on housing. They asked for 48, plus 1 clerical helper.

I do trust that you will see fit to support the gentleman from Minnesota on his amendment. This would give the service the same money it had last year plus allowance for retirement benefits.

Here's a letter I received from a farmer in my district about these regulations. I include it in its entirety:

BLACK OAK, ARK., January 25, 1957.
E. C. GATHINGS,

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington.

DEAR SIR: First, I want to thank you for your standing invitation to hear the problems of the people. I hope you will look into this situation with much concern.

We, the small farmers of Arkansas, are forced to use Mexican labor because we can't get anyone to pick our cotton and can't afford mechanical pickers.

Each year it has been harder to meet the demands of the committee for living conditions of the Mexican laborers. This year the requirements are unreasonable and outrageous. The farmers themselves aren't even accustomed to conditions required for them, and the Mexicans themselves are satisfied with conditions as they are now.

When I was growing up everyone took a bath in the living room. Now, we have to have a special room for them to bathe, a screened toilet, separate beds, new mattresses

and covers, cabinets, and the list goes on and on.

I am asking you to look into it and see who the committee is and why they are setting these standards. Look at a list of the requirements and judge for yourself if it is necessary just to pick cotton. We can't afford these ridiculous requirements.

We need your help badly.

Sincerely,

MARVIN VARLEY.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was interested in the remarks of my good friend and neighbor the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]. Do I understand that at the present time there is a regulation that would require a space 5½ feet by 6 feet or 5½ by 5 for each person in these houses?

Mr. FOGARTY. Five by six and three-quarters feet.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It seems to me that is an unusual amount of space for a human being to live in. I think the gentleman has stated quite a point here. Does that give the person a chance to stand up or sit down in a chair or lie down on a bed?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is all right for our friend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] to talk that way, but let me tell you something about what actually happens. Some of us know something about that. Many of these people who come up into our country to work during the summertime never had a roof over them at all until they came. They have lived out of doors.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Why not take the roof off if it bothers them? There should be some accommodation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why not take them out of the rain and out of the weather? Instead of that they never had anything to live under.

Mr. FOGARTY. I admire my friend from Minnesota in his desire for economy, but I think I have a better suggestion to make for him. If he wants real economy let him listen to this. When this program was started, farmers in different sections of the country were urged to use this Mexican farm labor. In order to get the program into operation we had to enter into an agreement with Mexico. The gentleman was on the committee at that time and I am sure

he will remember that in order to get the program started we had to charge the farmer \$15 for each Mexican he imported. We set up a revolving fund to get the program started, but it worked so well that that appropriation was paid off and quite a surplus was built up. Then the amount was reduced from \$15 to \$7. The program has succeeded to the extent that today we are spending \$2,500,000 for this program out of Federal funds which every taxpayer in the country is called upon to share, yet it helps only a few in that section of the country. Now, I do not think it is unreasonable for us or the Mexican Government to expect that when we enter into a treaty we provide them with decent housing conditions and with decent sanitary conditions.

The reason that these minimum standards the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] has been talking about have been established by the Department of Labor is because of complaints that have been coming in from all over the country of the filth that these Mexican laborers have been living in on some of these farms. I do not say that the majority of the farmers are using these Mexican laborers like animals or housing them like animals, but there are a number of places in those areas where this type of help is used where the housing facilities are no better than they have in a barn and sometimes they are worse than a barn. That is the reason these minimum requirements for housing of Mexican laborers have been established by the Department of Labor.

If there is any fault to find, in my opinion, we should find fault with the Department of Labor for having delayed so long in putting into effect some of these minimum standards they are suggesting now. Any fair-minded farmer and many are so doing I know, wants to provide better shelter for a man he is getting at cheap wages from a foreign country, than he provides for his hogs. I do not think it is too much to ask that these minimum requirements be met.

But that is getting a little afield from the point I started to make. The point I was getting at is this: I would think you could save a lot more money in this program if you would write a proviso in this bill that the farmers pay the entire cost. The farmers now are paying in this program about \$3½ million and we are paying about \$2½ million out of the Treasury. If you would write into this program that the farmers who are using this cheap labor in these areas would assume the cost, then we would be making a substantial reduction in this bill and it would be a real one.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Let us get down to what my amendment does. My amendment would refuse to give to the Department of Labor more personnel than it had in this particular fiscal year for the operation of this particular work. Why should we give them more personnel at this time?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is because those farmers who are using the Mexican nationals are asking that more of these nationals be brought into this country. This year these farmers have asked for a 15 percent increase in Mexican nationals to be used on their farms. We have allowed the Department in this budget a 4 percent increase, that is all, to administer the program. They started out with less than 200,000 nationals. This year they are up to 480,000 Mexican nationals who are being brought into this country. Where are you going to stop? I do not know. You are not going to stop anywhere unless you put a ceiling on the number of Mexican nationals that can be brought in. But if you want real economy in this program, you should write into this bill a provision to the effect that those who take advantage of this cheap labor will assume the cost of the program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has been a member of this particular subcommittee for some time and he has done a splendid job throughout the years, but I think sometimes the gentleman does not put the ceiling, as he called it, or the lid that he should place upon the personnel of some of these agencies. That is all I am trying to do here. I am trying to tell this Department of Labor that they shall not have any more personnel than they had last year. What is wrong with that?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am trying to be very realistic.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is trying to inject across the trail a red herring and everything of that nature.

Mr. FOGARTY. When you have increased the workload by 15 percent, that is a fact, and no one can dispute that. The farmers have asked for a 15-percent increase in importation of Mexican nationals to work on their farms this year, and we have allowed in this budget a 4-percent increase for administration. Now, if there is any red herring in that, you tell me where it is. If you are going to hold the number of employees administering this program to the 1957 level, you should hold the number of Mexican laborers to be imported to the 1957 level also.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Department of Agriculture has just this week put out an announcement to the effect that we will have 12 million less acres in production nationwide than we have ever had since the close of World War I because of the soil bank. Now, why should we need more of these Mexican laborers to come into this country?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know. That rests with the employers of this type of cheap labor. They tell the Department of Labor how many Mexicans they need, and the Department enters into an agreement with Mexico, an international agreement, and we have to live up to that agreement. We are paying to the tune now of over \$2 million to support a program that only helps a few sections of our country, and every taxpayer of the country is being called upon to assume that load. Now, if you want real economy in this bill, you ought to change

the law and let those who are using the labor assume the responsibility of paying for the administration of the program. I opposed this measure when it was first enacted into law, but since it is enacted into law, I am going to defend the necessary amount to administer the law. That is all I am doing now.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman, as usual, is most fair and does a splendid job in handling this bill. I was very much impressed by your statement here. I wonder if the gentleman—and he is very realistic about it—would be prepared, as chairman of the subcommittee, to offer such an amendment to require those who use this labor to bear the full burden of it. I think they ought to. They use a lot of it in my section. If the gentleman would offer such an amendment, I would be glad to go along with him.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think it should be my responsibility. I am in the position now of supporting the committee, and that is what I am doing up here now. But, I would not oppose such a recommendation. I think that recommendation ought to come from some of you people who have been talking so much about economy this afternoon. That is a real good place for the economy block to start working, and I think it would meet with unanimous approval all over the country.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN. I was very much interested in what the gentleman said. The gentleman mentioned a figure of 490,000 people, but presently that runs into the hundreds of thousands. I would like to ask how many inspectors does the Department presently have to police this program which involves, I might say, extensive regulations under the law. How many inspectors do they have?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know exactly how many inspectors they have at this time. But I do know that they will not have as many next year if this amendment passes because they will have to cut down in order to take care of the increased contracting of workers. But, in any case, it is going to be expected that no laborers be contracted to any grower who does not comply fully with the minimum housing, wage, and other standards.

Mr. HAGEN. They have only about 10 inspectors to police this whole program.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Immigration and Naturalization Service have expended a great deal of money on the so-called wetback problem, and they tell me they have done a pretty good job and have eliminated much of that problem. But, that is a problem of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman has made a very good case for the elimination of the entire amount of \$2.5 million in this bill for this Mexican labor. Now, the gentleman says we should offer an amendment to the bill to do certain things. Well, of course, as the gentleman from Minnesota said, that would be legislation on an appropriation bill. The gentleman knows that I have been very dubious about this whole program. Years before we entered into this treaty the farmers of the United States of America got plenty of help from Mexico. They went down there and recruited their help, brought it back up here, and sent it back when they were through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I am going to read. I do not have any pride of authorship; maybe somebody else can do a better job. I am not going to offer it now, because it would not be an amendment to the amendment that is before us. But it is as follows:

On page 9, line 15, insert *Provided*, That hereafter each farmer who receives Mexican labor for farm work shall pay to the United States the sum of \$12 for each man he receives each year.

That is about as close as I could figure it, to what would be required to make the United States Treasury whole. It may not be exactly right and it may be somebody can do better with it. But I think somebody ought to offer that kind of an amendment and it ought to be approved. That is all I have to say at this time.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COAD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 9, line 15, strike out "\$2,500,000."

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have almost unanimous agreement here on the basic realization of the fact that the taxpayers should not pay for the importation of labor which is almost serfdom and slave labor in the beginning.

In the second place, it is not conceivable to stretch the imagination to the extent of believing that all of the people of the United States benefit by this program of the importation of Mexican labor into the United States. I am certain, so far as I can tell, that labor itself does not welcome this kind of imported labor in competition with that which we have already established amongst our people in the United States.

Thirdly, it is obvious, as you go out into the rural areas of these United States that people by droves have gone from the farms and ranches into the towns looking for employment. I have been receiving letters constantly from my constituency concerning people from the farms in my district who have gone

into town in competition with the labor market which already has been established there.

If it is the policy of the Federal Government to import labor, then we by that means disrupt further the labor market we have already established. We would then have more of a farm labor problem than we ever had in the beginning. I trust that there will be support for this amendment to strike out the entire item of appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am going to support the gentleman's substitute because I feel that the time has come when we have to get away from some of these deals that are costing the Federal Government so much money. Certainly this is a place where we can do it and we would not be hurting anyone but helping a great many people in the United States who need to work.

(Mr. COAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is not generally understood that this problem of Mexican labor is of interest to a State as far north as Minnesota, but it is of tremendous interest to my district particularly and I think to southern Minnesota in general because for a number of years the great pea and corn canning industries of Minnesota have had to depend largely on this type of labor coming from either Jamaica or Mexico.

I am perfectly familiar with the treatment of those men. They are paid the going wages. There is talk about cheap labor, but they are paid the going wages everybody else is paid.

Why are they needed? They are needed because local American labor does not want to do the type of work that is necessary to be done. I suppose it is true in California, in Indiana, and in other parts of the country that you have to depend on this type of labor. It has to be imported. The men are treated excellently. The firms who hire these people give them the best kind of care and food and every attention they would give any other type of labor.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I am happy that the gentleman has referred to the State of Indiana, for two reasons: First of all, we, too, produce some of the very best tomatoes and the best tomato juice. I think the Members of the House can attest to that fact. In that area we have stoop labor. We cannot get help from the factory, the farm, or the cities to do that kind of labor.

I compliment the gentleman on his stand on this subject. In our area Mexicans and Jamaicans and others have been coming in. I think it is proper

we should keep them. Last year, with the support of the farm and labor organizations, I introduced a migratory farm labor bill, and I call to the attention of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that we need additional money for that purpose.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Is it not a fact that in Minnesota as in California the farmers would prefer to have domestic, local labor rather than this imported labor?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course they would.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Is it not a fact this labor costs more to the farmer than domestic labor does?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman is right, because they have to pay the transportation and other expenses.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. They have to get a certificate that no domestic labor is available, they have to pay the going rate plus transportation to and from Mexico, and they have to pay insurance and other charges.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The reason they have to get this labor is that domestic labor is not available. They cannot get it.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota was permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is absolutely correct in what he has to say as to the need for this program. The average farmer or laboring man up our way would never consent to going into the fields, such as the gentleman has, and do this stoop labor.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Consequently, I am opposed to the substitute for my amendment. All I am seeking to do is cut down the agency requirements here to a level consistent with what they had in fiscal 1957, with which they handled this program. Does not the gentleman feel they should be able to do a satisfactory job with the personnel and with the \$2,100,000 they had available in fiscal 1957?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I think they can carry out the program with the present personnel they have.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I congratulate the gentleman on the position he has taken here. In the State of Wyoming, together with about 17 other States, we raise sugar beets. It is impossible to get local people or any people in the United States to perform that type of stoop labor. I would just like to point out that this has done the people of the country a great deal of good. We had this legislation up for discussion a year ago, and it was predicted it was going to hurt the

consumer. What is the fact today? The world market for sugar is \$1 higher than the market here in the United States. It is important that we preserve our industry. They have to have this labor. I am for economy, if it is necessary, and if it is proper, as it seems to me it is and I would support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to pay for it if we need it.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to clarify this situation a little bit because I detect some confusion here. An amendment was offered to strike out the \$2,500,000 which is salaries and expenses for carrying on this program. It has been pointed out by the very able chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that the people who use this labor now pay \$7 for each 1 of them. It was formerly \$12 and it is now \$7. It is also pointed out that they anticipate \$490,000 of that will be used during the next year. At \$7 each that will run well over the \$2,500,000. So, according to that, the thing is self-supporting and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa would actually deprive the Treasury of some money.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. FISHER. Personally, I represent a district along the Mexican border and we make some use of these nationals. So far as I know the employers would be pleased to pay \$12. Of course, that would be a matter for the Committee on Agriculture to determine. I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa, if he wants to do something constructive on this, that he introduce a bill and go before the Committee on Agriculture to amend the Mexican Labor Act and increase it from \$7 to \$14 or \$12 or whatever it is.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. That is already provided for in the law. The only reason they reduced the fees was because of the fact that they were accumulating a profit and it was never intended that the Federal Government should make a profit on this.

Mr. FISHER. Of course not. So actually this is a self-supporting program.

Mr. COOLEY. Now they have increased the fees so as to make it self-supporting.

Mr. FISHER. Now getting back to the original proposition offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], I subscribe to his amendment which I think is sound because they are asking for some additional employees with particular reference to this housing thing which, if examined carefully, will not appear to be sound. I think they have the employees. I think they have about 60 of them to do that or more than 40, I know.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to get something clear in my own mind before

I vote on the amendment. Is it not a fact that the figures, as they come to us from the Committee on Appropriations, is actually a self-supporting figure, therefore, there is actually no reduction here and no weight upon the taxpayer?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am not sure about that, I will say to my colleague.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Can I ask the chairman of the committee whether he would answer that question? Is it not true that this \$7 now being paid will actually carry the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and that, therefore, this reduction is no relief and actually no relief to the taxpayers and all it does is to penalize the Department in doing the job properly of enforcing an international agreement made between Mexico and the United States?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct. If they are thinking of using 490,000 workers, as they anticipate in 1958, you are absolutely right.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. So the money is actually coming from the farmers themselves, and what the gentleman from Minnesota has proposed is not in any way a saving to the taxpayer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly this money is a direct appropriation and surely the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] will not say that it is a crime to try to save the taxpayers a few dollars. The money that does come in from the program does go into the Treasury, but that is no reason why we should squander it all on bureaucrats here and scatter it all the way over the State of California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Bureaucrats are not limited to the State of California.

May I say in answer to that, this is an agreement between Mexico and the United States, and if we do not enforce it we are doing a great deal to ruin the so-called good neighbor policy between the two countries.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. I would just like to say that these 490,000 Mexicans they are bringing in for temporary work are all exempt from our income tax laws. The men who employ them pay nothing into the social security tax at all. I am of the opinion it would be wise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and strike out the whole program.

Mr. DENTON. That goes to pay a part of the expense, but this \$2½ million comes out of the Treasury, that is to supervise this program. It seems to me there is no reason why all the people of the United States should pay for the supervising of this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to speak or is he going to yield some more?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am going to speak myself this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would say in conclusion of this colloquy that has taken place, it is obvious that this is an important program. I would dislike to see the House strike out this entire program. I am as economy-minded as anybody in this House. But I think it would be a serious mistake to strike out this entire program. I do concur with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who is offering the amendment, which I support and I shall support it on a vote, but I certainly shall oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to strike out all of this appropriation, because this is a highly necessary program. It is highly necessary that it be supervised by the Government in the interest of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

I want to say to the members of the committee that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and I have agreed that after the amendments relating to this paragraph are disposed of the Committee will rise tonight. The sooner we get through with this the sooner we will rise.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN insert "Provided, That the full amount provided herein shall be reimbursed to the Treasury through payments by farmers using such labor on a pro rata basis."

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. COLMER. I wonder if the gentleman would reserve the point of order.

Mr. GATHINGS. I will reserve it but I would like to have it ruled on later.

Mr. COLMER. Certainly. That is what I meant.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas reserves the point of order against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Let me say this: I offered this amendment in good faith, as a result of the colloquy that ensued a moment ago and the statement of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

I believe in practicing what you preach. I am one of those who is very much of the economy mind. I am not a new convert to this subject. If the people want to use this labor why should the Federal Government be required to

pay for their use? In the final analysis it is a subsidy.

Quite a bit of this labor is used in my State, but I repeat I believe in practicing what I preach. If we are going to retrench and economize we are going to have to go down the line and not only economize and retrench upon those items that do not affect us, but if we are going to cut we are going to have to cut where it hurts sometimes.

This Government owes approximately \$276 billion in debt. If we started right now to retire that debt at the rate of \$5 billion a year, there would not be many of us around when we got through paying it off, yet we continue to operate on deficit spending or at least failing to do anything about reducing it.

I do not like to bore you with these elementary facts, but does it not alarm you, as it does your taxpayers at home, that it is costing more to service the national debt than it cost to operate the whole Federal Government a quarter of a century ago? Somewhere down the line we have got to make a stand, and I offer this amendment in good faith. I hope it will be adopted and that the point of order will not prevail.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If it were possible to vote for this amendment at this time without a point of order being raised against it I would support the amendment to my amendment. I think it is a good one.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. For the sake of the record on the question of who is now supporting this amendment I would like to point out that when this amendment was offered to this legislation when it was considered by the House the best we could get was 62 votes for it.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman means this particular amendment was offered?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman's recollection I am sure is correct. I have no particular recollection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLMER. No. I offered it in good faith and I stand on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. To what amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. The amendment striking out \$2,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think most of the Members will remember the tragedy that happened on the floor of this House on one occasion when we were discussing this controversial problem. On that occasion several Members of this House came very near losing their

lives. Several were seriously injured. I hope nothing like that will happen while I am talking about this amendment today.

I think most of the Members will also remember that while I have supported this Mexican labor program I have had some very serious misgivings about it, but I feel now that since we have a treaty with Mexico we have no alternative other than to keep faith with that treaty. In addition to that, the farmers of the Nation are counting on this Mexican labor. If the labor is not permitted to come in legally you may be sure that the laborers will be brought in illegally. In the first place, I prefer to have the farm labor of this country performed by American workers, but, actually, the stoop labor that is performed by these Mexican nationals is a type of labor that the American worker does not seem to be interested in.

The cost of transportation, subsistence, and maintenance is paid for by the employer and we fixed this in the legislation in our committee. I believe we fixed a limit of \$15 per person. For a while that fee was charged and a surplus was accumulated in the fund. Then the fee was reduced gradually until the fee went down to \$3 and \$1, \$3 for the original contract of employment and \$1 for re-employment. They have increased those fees back to \$4 and \$7. I suppose that the people in the Department who fix the amount of the fee fix it with the idea of making the program, or at least that part of it, self-supporting.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the department have the authority to place these fees wherever they see fit up to a certain amount? In other words, is there any limit?

Mr. COOLEY. I may say to the gentleman I have not seen this law in a long time, but my recollection is we fixed a ceiling and left it in the discretion of the department to fix the fees under the ceiling of \$15.

Mr. JENSEN. If that is the case, then it appears to me that language could be written in this bill without having a point of order made against it which would provide that the fee shall be sufficient to pay the administrative costs.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the Government does bear the administrative costs. You will recall that these laborers performed some very essential work during the time of the war when we were in an emergency.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Let me say this: I think the sense of the Members of the House is that this project should be self-supporting. Could not the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations inform the department that handles this project that it place these fees on a basis where the program will be self-supporting?

Mr. COOLEY. I doubt if that would be compatible with either the letter or the spirit of the basic legislation. I will say to the gentleman and also the gen-

tleman from Iowa who offered the amendment that the matter will receive the attention of our committee. I am inclined to say now that I would be in favor of making this program self-supporting in its entirety. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is chairman of the subcommittee that handles the legislation. He is here and I know he is interested in the program.

I want to say before you vote on the gentleman's amendment, please do not knock out the \$2½ million and wreck this program, and, at the same time break faith with this treaty with Mexico. That is all the interest I have. I will go further and say I will try to have the committee to consider immediately the advisability of making the program self-supporting in the future.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. We make the farmer pay \$15 now, which covers certain expenses, such as transportation and things like that. But this \$2½ million does not come from the revolving fund, it comes from the Treasury and covers the supervisory program.

Mr. COOLEY. And, I say if it is wrong then we should change it, we should change it in the House Committee on Agriculture rather than on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I know from first-hand that this labor program is most important to Texas and many other areas, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for permitting me to record my opposition to the proposed amendment by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COOLEY. I think so, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. LONG addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The substitute to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 104, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL WEEK

(Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House to the fact that the Laymen's National Committee, which is an organization of all faiths and dedicated to the furtherance of religion in man's everyday life, will sponsor the 13th annual National Sunday School Week April 8 through 14. The official theme for this year's observance is "Sunday School: Source of Spiritual Strength." It is hoped that this theme will be widely stressed by all avenues of communication in order to emphasize to the whole country the importance of early religious training for our young people—the same young people who will become the leaders of the Nation and to a considerable extent, of the world.

HOPKINTON-EVERETT RESERVOIR PROJECT, MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include a bill introduced by her.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have this afternoon introduced a bill which authorizes the appropriation of \$800,000 for the important work of the construction of the Hopkinton-Everett Dam in New Hampshire in order to prevent floods in the Merrimack Valley. The able Member of Congress [Mr. MERROW of New Hampshire] introduced a companion bill. It is an extremely important measure to us in the Merrimack Valley. I hope the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the House will help secure the passage of this bill. The very distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has promised us a hearing on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill to which I have referred is as follows:

A bill to appropriate \$800,000 for the construction of the Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir project in the Merrimack River Basin.

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$800,000 to be expended by the Chief of Engineers under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Army to construct the Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir project in the Merrimack River Basin, as heretofore authorized by law.

THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN OF THE NATION IS IN NEED OF IMMEDIATE TAX RELIEF

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1957, in an effort to aid small business, I introduced H. R. 5704, a bill to establish corporate income tax rates at 22 percent normal tax and 30 percent surtax.

This bill, which was introduced in cooperation with the small-business men of my congressional district, amends section II of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code and lowers the normal tax rate on all taxable corporate income from 30 percent to 22 percent and increases the surtax rate from 22 percent to 30 percent on taxable income in excess of \$25,000.

If the provisions of H. R. 5704 are enacted into law, the change would apply only to taxable years starting after December 31, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5704 is identical to several bills introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives and is in keeping with the general desire on the part of many Members of Congress who have pledged themselves to secure tax relief for the little-business men and who are determined to redeem that pledge.

Contrary to the general impression of the 4,280,000 business concerns in the United States, as of January 1, 1957, only 200,000 of this number can be considered as big business, which means that 4,080,000 or 95 percent of all business concerns in the United States are classified as small business.

According to available statistics, the national income for the calendar year 1956 of all small business concerns in the United States totaled nearly \$20 billion and represents between 40 and 50 percent of the total dollar business of all manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing and service firms in the United States.

From the standpoint of employment, the Nation's business concerns employed 38,390,000, with 17 million of this number being employed by big business with 500 or more employees and the remaining 21,500,000 by small business concerns with less than 500 employees.

As I have already mentioned, 95 percent of all the business concerns in the United States are classified as small business, employing less than 500 persons.

This is especially true in my home State of Pennsylvania where of the 255,000 business concerns, only 13,000 are classified as big business with the remaining 242,000 in the small business category.

Mr. Speaker, legislation such as H. R. 5704 providing tax relief to small business concerns in the United States is desperately needed if small business firms are not only to exist but to grow and modernize in keeping with the Nation's expanding economy.

One of the real threats to the economy of our Nation at the present time is the inability of small business concerns to

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued March 29, 1957

For actions of March 28, 1957

85th-1st, No. 54

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Alcohol.....29	Flood control.....12	Public Law 480.....13
Appropriations.....1	Food and Drug.....1	Public works.....12
Auditorium.....13	Food, distribution.....8	Reclamation.....13
Budget.....13,19,25	inspection.....24	Research.....16
CCC.....28	Foreign aid.....7	Small business.....14
Civil defense.....26	Forestry.....2,13,31	Soil bank.....12
Cooperatives.....30	Lands.....2	St. Lawrence Seaway....21
Corn.....3	Legislative program.....13	Taxation.....5,18,23
Correspondence.....15	Parity.....10	Trade, foreign.....6
Cotton.....13	Personnel.....22	Transportation.....9,23
Dairy industry.....30	Plant pests.....13	Veterans' benefits.....22
Disaster relief.....4	Poultry.....11	Water, rights.....12
Farm income.....18	Property.....16,27	pollution.....32
Farm program.....3,10,20	Public debt.....1	Wildlife.....17

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported poultry inspection bill. Senate passed omnibus public works bill. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House Rules Committee cleared military land withdrawals bill. Rep. Schwengel criticized delay in action on corn bill. Sens. Douglas and Curtis introduced and Sen. Douglas discussed bill to provide alcohol butadiene research program. Sen. Aiken introduced and discussed bill to authorize dairy cooperatives to bargain with purchasers singly or in groups. Rep. Coad proposed and discussed measure to investigate manner in which CCC sells certain commodities.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 4138-67, 4169, A2535). Agreed, 83 to 82, to an amendment by Rep. Jonas to reduce the funds for the Food and Drug Administration from \$9,300,000 to \$7,973,000 (pp. 4156-67).
Rep. Rhodes spoke in favor of legislation to require the President to submit in his budget a figure to ^{be} used to pay on the public debt. pp. 4174-75
Rep. Fascell urged that the budget be cut, and inserted a letter and newspaper article on the subject. pp. 4193-97
2. FORESTRY. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 5538, to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the U. S. shall not become effective until approved by Congress (H. Rept. 287). pp. 4168, 4198
3. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Schwengel criticized the delay in passage of corn legislation and stated that he had decided to state the "facts about this controversy as I see them." pp. 4169-70
4. DISASTER RELIEF. Both Houses received from the President a report on the administration of Federal disaster relief as required under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (H. Doc. 142). pp. 4053, 4136

5. TAXATION. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H.R. 4090, to extend the present corporate income and certain excise tax rates for 15 months. This bill is now ready for the President. pp. 4136-7
6. FOREIGN TRADE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 4136, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may make loans (H. Rept. 286). pp. 4167-68
7. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Meader inserted his Reader's Digest article, "Our Foreign-Aid Program - A Bureaucratic Nightmare," and copies of a number of letters he had received concerning the article. pp. 4182-90

SENATE

8. FOOD SUPPLY. Received a proposed bill from the President of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; to the District of Columbia Committee. pp. 4053-4
9. TRANSPORTATION. Received a N. D. Legislature resolution opposing passage of the bill to repeal the long-and-short-haul clause of the Interstate Commerce Act, in the interests of preventing lower rates for long hauls than for short ones. p. 4054
10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution from Co-op Services, Inc., New York Mills, Minn., favoring a production payment system to assure 100% of parity returns to family farmers, and stating "farmers and business . . . are greatly disturbed by the Secretary of Agriculture's present policies." p. 4056
11. POULTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported S. 1747, an original bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by this Department of poultry and poultry products (S. Rept. 195). p. 4056
12. PUBLIC WORKS. Passed with amendments, S. 497, the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Acts of 1957, by a 42-to-22 vote (p. 4133). Adopted Committee amendments en bloc (pp. 4070-1).

Agreed to the following amendment: by Sen. Barrett, to insure that conservation water storage space be used in accord with state law (pp. 4124-5).

Rejected the following amendments: by Sen. Douglas to authorize the President to postpone 25% of the projects least essential (pp. 4072-98), including comments by Sen. Neuberger on the comparative soil bank payments to Nebr., Ill., and Ore. (p. 4083); by Sen. Hruska, to recommit the bill with instructions, 27-55 (pp. 4101-12); by Sen. Neuberger to delete the Bruces Eddy Dam in Ida. (pp. 4112-19); by Sen. Watkins to strike out a section dealing with State water rights (pp. 4119-24); by Sen. Case to increase payments to landowners for land acquired for reservoir purposes (pp. 4126-9); and by Sen. Watkins to provide that State and local governments assume 50% or more of the construction and operation costs (pp. 4129-32).
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that consideration of the following bills, among others, would begin on Mar. 29; S. 1585, to provide for a joint committee on the budget; S. 685 and H.R. 4813, to extend the life of the D. C. Auditorium Commission; S. 1034, to authorize the transfer of the Midwest Claypan Research station to the U. of Mo.; S. 812, to freeze price supports for extra long staple cotton at 75% of parity; S. 1314, to extend

Page 3, line 18, strike out "April" and insert "July."

Page 3, line 20, strike out "July" and insert "October."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "April" and insert "July."

Page 3, line 25, strike out "July" and insert "October."

Page 4, line 2, strike out "August" and insert "November."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "April" and insert "July."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide a 15-month extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?*

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4090, as it passed the House, would have extended for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates. The extensions provided by the House bill covered the period April 1, 1957, through March 31, 1958.

The Senate amendments would extend the existing corporate normal-tax rate and the excise-tax rates applicable to distilled spirits, cigarettes, automobiles and automobile parts and accessories for 15 months rather than for the 12-month period covered by the House bill. Thus, under the Senate amendment, expiration of the extended rates will coincide with the close of the Government's fiscal year and would parallel the appropriation acts. It was stated in the Senate report that as a result of the amendments "the Congress will be in a better position to review these tax rates concurrently with the appropriation bills next year."

For the fiscal year 1958, the Senate amendments will increase the revenues derived from extension of these taxes by \$237 million. Of this amount \$65 million is attributable to the corporate normal tax; \$64 million, alcoholic beverages; \$50 million, cigarettes; \$51 million, passenger automobiles; and \$7 million, automobile parts and accessories.

The 12 months' extension under the House would have produced \$2,075,000,000 from corporate income taxes and \$900,000,000 from excise taxes, making a total of \$2,975,000,000. The 15 months' extension under the Senate amendment will produce \$2,600,000,000 from corporate taxes and \$1,100,000,000 from excise taxes, making a total of \$3,700,000,000, or an additional \$700,000,000 in revenue compared to the House-passed bill.

I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendments.

(Mr. REED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the action of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in asking the House to agree to the Senate amendments to H. R. 4090. It will be

recalled that this legislation was passed by the House of Representatives to provide for a 1-year extension of the present 52-percent tax rate applicable to corporate income and to continue the existing excise tax rates applicable to alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, automobiles, and automobile parts and accessories. The Senate in its consideration of this legislation made the period of extension 15 months instead of 1 year so as to coincide with the termination of the fiscal year. The House-passed version of H. R. 4090 had a full year revenue effect of \$3 billion. As modified by the Senate amendments, H. R. 4090 would have a revenue effect of \$3.7 billion. These Senate amendments have the concurrence of the Department of the Treasury.

THE KOKOMO TRIBUNE

(Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that tribute should be paid to the press of this country. There are many times when those of us in public life may wonder whether or not the press has been representing events as we see them. It is true that even in the membership in the House there is a division of opinion, and, thus, it can be expected when reporters, as newsmen, write their findings and observations in their respective newspapers.

The progress of certain newspapers has been an encouragement because they have helped to disseminate news as a public service.

I would like to pay tribute to all of the newspapers in the Fifth Congressional District, and I feel that I do so in extending greetings and congratulations to the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune. They have a new addition to their building and have installed new equipment. On March 28 an open house was held in order that the citizens of that community could view the progress of this very important portion of their community. I join the many citizens of Kokomo and friends of the Kokomo Tribune in wishing them continued success.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Anderson, Mont.	Eberharter	Jones, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Frelinghuysen	Kearney
Aspinall	Fulton	Keeney
Ayres	Gregory	Moulder, Mo.
Bass, N. H.	Gubser	Powell
Bowler	Gwinn	Prouty
Boykin	Henderson	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Hill	Roberts
Davis, Tenn.	Hillings	Rogers, Tex.
Dies	Holfield	Scherer
Diggs	Holtzman	Williams, N. Y.
	Ikard	
	Jackson	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 399 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House; but in order to conserve the time of the House, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I received last night and this morning six long-distance telephone calls from my district and the city of St. Louis. All of them were from men of high standing, and my friends. Each of them said about the same thing.

They explained: There will be an appropriations bill before you today or tomorrow. It was evident that they had been advised by someone thoroughly familiar with the situation here in the House.

They said: "The bill carries an appropriation for arthritis and we want to ask you as a personal favor to vote against cutting any part of the budget estimate."

I said: "I am very much interested in your suggestion. But I would like to be certain that I understand just what you have in mind. You favor the largest appropriation for the purpose? Are you also in favor of the highest taxes? Or do you think taxes ought to be cut? Do you think we ought to continue to levy war taxes in time of peace? Do you favor the continued increase in the cost of living reported by the Government? Or do you favor lower taxes and stabilization of the purchasing power of the dollar?"

They said they had not thought about that part of it. But here is the payoff: I asked: "Are you troubled with arthritis?"

They said: "No, of course not."

I asked: "Is any member of your family troubled with arthritis?"

"Oh, no."

"Well, why are you interested in this?"

"Someone asked me to telephone you about it."

I asked: "Are the people who asked you to telephone me troubled with arthritis?"

"I hardly think so."

Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House is receiving these pressure messages. But they do not represent the sentiment of your constituents or your district. And especially they do not represent the views of your taxpayers. They do not come from those who are suffering from arthritis.

They are organized propaganda, pure and simple. If you could follow them up and learn where they came from you would find that they come directly from Washington. They could be traced right back to people who have a professional and personal interest, people who want jobs and higher salaries. Let us make no mistake about that.

Are we so naive as to be taken by such transparent deception? That is what it is. They are trying to leave the impression that the sentiment back home favors big increases and continued high taxes and higher cost of living.

"Vainly is the snare spread in sight of the bird."

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, several Members have come to me this morning asking about the progress on this bill. I have told them that there will be no chance of finishing it today. We will try to finish it tomorrow; whether we can or not is unknown at this time. But I do want to reiterate that if these crippling amendments that have been agreed to are continued, you can expect to have 12 or 15 rollcalls when the day arrives to vote for final passage.

You know as well as I know that in order to get a rollcall a sufficient number of Members have to stand. I am sure that those Members who have been supporting the committee's position on my side will stand up and ask for a rollcall. I hope when the time comes that you Members on the Republican side who have just applauded my announcement can be counted on to stand up at the same time and ask to be counted too.

In answer to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] that he has been besieged with 6 or 8 telegrams or phone calls from the city of St. Louis on behalf of people who are afflicted with arthritis in this country, let me say that I have known for several years how these voluntary organizations all over the country are operated. In the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, Mental Hygiene and

many others, I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that we have some of the most dedicated people in this country serving on these committees. I know that is so in connection with the Foundation on Arthritis and Rheumatism. They have some of the most dedicated people—Americans—both Republicans and Democrats, serving at no cost to the organization at all. So, it is not as the gentleman has informed the House that these telegrams have been inspired by hired personnel on these voluntary committees. That just is not the case and I want that straightened out.

However, if it were the case, they are American citizens, they have the right to appeal to you and to me and to every other Member of the Congress for what they believe is right. I happen to believe they are doing the right thing. If you believe that the amounts in this bill are too large for research on arthritis and rheumatism, with 10 million people of our country afflicted with that disease—many of them bedridden—if you think that they are getting enough support now and that further research is not going to do any good, I hope you will have the courage to get up in this committee and offer an amendment to cut this appropriation. I do not believe that the Institute for Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases is given enough money this year because there are more good, sound applications for research grants in the field of arthritis and rheumatism and in gastroenterology during the past year than we appropriated money for in the last session of the Congress.

There are 10 million people in the United States afflicted with arthritis and rheumatism. I don't believe these 10 million people should be ignored and allowed to continue to suffer the painful and crippling effects of arthritis in their declining years. Instead I believe that we should increase the funds for research in this area and we should vote a sufficient increase over last year's figure to put every competent medical investigator in the arthritic field to work on the cause and cure of the disease.

It was this committee in 1947 or 1948, that was told by Dr. Hench, of the Mayo Clinic, of the discovery of the new wonder drugs, cortisone and ACTH, that had been used on men and women bedridden for several years. With the injection of cortisone and ACTH these men and women were up and around for the first time in 10 or 15 years. As a result of this kind of testimony, not from a Federal bureaucrat but from one of the most eminent medical scientists in the world, from one of the outstanding medical institutions in the world, this committee, without any advice from the administration, appropriated, and you approved, \$3 million more than the President asked for at that time to do further research in the field of cortisone and ACTH.

As the result of that action of this committee and the House, thousands of people afflicted with arthritis, the leadingcrippler of mankind at this time, have been alleviated; they have gotten out of bed and they have returned to

work. To me that is good, sound financing. It is using good judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(Mr. FOGARTY, at the request of Mr. BUDGE, was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOGARTY. I will yield to the gentleman in just a moment.

When a new drug like that comes on the market, the cost is prohibitive. I cannot give you exact figures how much it cost per gram at that time to manufacture that particular kind of drug, but in round figures it was about \$200 a gram, which made it impossible for the average person in this country to take advantage of its use. But, because of the action of this committee approving \$3 million for research, we found a synthetic way of producing the drug, and within 2 years it was down to a price where the average person could afford to buy it. As the result of that action, that drug has been made available to millions of people who otherwise would not have been able to avail themselves of it. When it was first given to these people by injection there were many side effects. Through further research those side effects have been eliminated or reduced and today it is taken orally. It is now truly one of the wonder drugs of this generation. It has saved millions of lives all over this country, not only alleviating rheumatism and arthritis but affecting the death-dealing diseases as well, such as rheumatic fever in children.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, the gentleman from Rhode Island knows there are none of us here taking the position of not wishing to do everything we can to be of assistance to those who are afflicted with the ailments which befall the human body. The question is just how adequately can the funds be utilized. I would ask the gentleman if it is not a fact—take the National Institutes of Health—that they themselves estimate that they will have an unexpended balance at the end of this fiscal year of over \$10 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BUDGE. We assume, in these programs, that the people who prepare the budget for them know approximately how much they can intelligently spend. In the bill which the gentleman brings to the floor, how do the figures for the National Institutes of Health compare with the budget estimates?

Mr. FOGARTY. The one we have brought to the floor?

Mr. BUDGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOGARTY. We have allowed the full amount that they asked this year. That was not to my liking, of course, because I wanted to allow more funds than the Bureau of the Budget approved for programs such as heart and cancer and

mental health. In the bill before us we have allowed the exact amount the Bureau of the Budget has requested with this one change; they did make a request to raise the overhead item on these grants to the institutes for research from 15 percent to 25 percent. In the Institutes alone that amounted to some \$6,800,000. We did not approve that increase from 15 percent to 25 percent for overhead on the basis that we had allowed them an increase from 8 percent to 15 percent only 2 years ago for the same purpose. When we disallowed that increase we said in effect that we were still going to keep the same amount of money and the additional money would be used for research instead of for the other purpose. That was the significant change.

Mr. BUDGE. In effect then, what the gentleman's subcommittee did was to reduce the overhead item, which is the identical thing to which he has been objecting in his opposition to the amendments with which we have been dealing here during the last 2 days, but after reducing the overhead the committee diverted the extra 10 percent, which came to better than \$6 million, for research over and above the budget figures?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not so. What we did was to keep the figure requested by the Budget Bureau and channel into research what was requested for overhead. We earmarked \$620,000, which would have been that portion of the 10 percent of overhead in the Institute for Neurology for a new program of research on the problem of the hard of hearing and speech defects in children. In cancer we earmarked \$1,616,000 for the same purpose; that is, for a start in entering into contracts with pharmaceutical houses to do research on compounds and antibiotics that they have on their shelves which might have some anticancer effects. We did that in addition to earmarking the other 10 percent.

Mr. BUDGE. The net result was that even with an unexpended balance as of the end of this fiscal year in excess of \$10 million, we have in this bill some \$6 or \$7 million above the budget figure.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right. And it is about \$5 or \$6 million less than I think it should be. On the other hand, the \$10 million the gentleman speaks of had nothing whatsoever to do with the Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases nor did it have anything to do with the Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. Those two Institutes expended all their funds. They had more applications for new grants than we gave them money for, and as a result they were not able to take care of the good, approved applications for research in those two Institutes. But in heart, in cancer, and in mental health they did have unexpended funds. I think that is a good sign, too, because when we gave them this additional money a year ago, \$50 million over and above the budget, I made the statement on the floor that this was a huge increase above the previous year and we expected that the National Institutes of Health would continue on the fine programs and estab-

lish standards, which they did establish, for granting applications for research; that they would continue on that same basis, not loosen up. As a result, they have kept their word given to Congress and they are returning about \$10 million to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman agrees, then, that the situation is that you have an unexpended balance for this fiscal year of over \$10 million and yet you go over the budget \$6 million or \$7 million for the next year. Would the gentleman agree it would be proper to lump all of these items into one so that they could be used as the officials of the National Institutes feel they should be used?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, I do not. I do not believe in lumping it all in one part. The gentleman and I disagreed on that 3 or 4 years ago. I think we ought to keep these Institutes as they are. We ought to know what we are spending for cancer, we ought to know what we are spending for heart research, we ought to know what we are spending for mental health research. That is the reason we put them in a categorical column.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman on the importance of research in this program. I think it ought to go forward. I would differ in one respect, that we should be careful not to give the Government all the credit for the advance in research because 75 percent of the prescriptions now being filled over the drugstore counters were not known 12 or 15 years ago. The great progress in research has been made by private industry, drug houses, and scientists outside the Government in developing cortisone and the other drugs. It is not entirely with the Government. The Government has been a big help, I agree with the gentleman. We ought to proceed along that line, but do not give the Government all the credit.

Mr. FOGARTY. I hope I was not misunderstood. I did not say the Federal Government was solely responsible for the advances that have been made in the past 10 years, but it has been largely responsible for it. The Government certainly has moved ahead side by side with industry and the voluntary agencies. There has not been a program in the Federal Government that has worked with less confusion than this one, because we have had complete agreement among the voluntary agencies and the Federal Government, on all these applications for grants. The statement I did make was that if this Congress had not appropriated \$3 million more than the Budget requested in 1948 for research in cortisone we would not have had penicillin as we have today, that particular wonder drug as soon as we did. Further, if we were not in a war, the last World War, we would not have had penicillin, as we have today, without Government funds. How many millions of dollars were expended on research for developing penicillin, that has saved so many thousands of lives in the

last 15 years, I have no estimate, but I do know, and I think every doctor in the land will agree, that if it had not been for the participation of the Federal Government in the field of developing penicillin during the last World War thousands of lives would have been lost in the last 15 years.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have to disagree with the gentleman on that because it was a private citizen, an individual, that developed penicillin. It was not what the Government did. The Government might have given a little stimulus, but cortisone, penicillin, and streptomycin were all developed outside the Government help and would have been here whether the Government had been in the field or not.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is a doctor and I do not like to disagree with him but he is completely wrong on the history and the facts. I am quoting some of the finest research doctors in the world who have appeared before our committee, who did not agree with the gentleman's statement. I am not a doctor as I have said but I have had experience with some of these leading doctors of the world who appear before our committee every year. I can hardly believe that the gentleman presumes to supersede with his judgment the conclusions and convictions of the Nobel prizewinners whose testimony I am referring to now. It was Government funds appropriated by the Congress that worked on the cultures making penicillin available in the form that it could be used in the battlefields of World War II. If it were not for the research done with these Federal funds, thousands of men wounded in the Army, Navy, and Air Force who are alive today would have died.

So I am afraid the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, if we could be sure—that we could eradicate disease—any disease—with the money which we are asked to appropriate here, no amount of money would be too great for us to appropriate for these highly desirable purposes.

But, Mr. Chairman, appropriating money for research does not mean success in finding remedies—too often does not mean that we are to get anything at all.

Listening to this debate you get the impression that it was Government research and Government funds that discovered penicillin and cortisone. Nothing could be further from the facts. Both were discovered and developed privately and without any Government cooperation whatever.

Penicillin was discovered entirely by accident by an obscure doctor working on his own time and means. All of these notable reagents were originated by individual private scientists and practicing physicians working by themselves and without Government millions.

And the saving in the cost of manufacture of drugs cannot be credited solely to Federal research. There is not a great

foundation in the country today that is not committing large staffs and laboratories in this work. There is not a pharmaceutical house or a drug manufacturer in the country that does not maintain its private research unassisted on all these problem formulas. The situation would not be greatly changed today if no appropriations carried by this bill had ever been passed.

The truth is that there is no assurance that a single dollar being provided here in this or any other appropriation bill will develop anything worthwhile.

We ought to invest something in these items but we should not delude ourselves into believing that results are assured.

The point at issue in this proposed appropriation for the cure of arthritis is that we are asked to appropriate \$2 million more than was appropriated last year, when we were not able to spend all that was appropriated last year. So much money was appropriated for this item last year that we could not spend it and they had to turn a large part of it back. If that is true, why go ahead and vote \$2 million more, when we already had too much.

Mr. Chairman, as I listened to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island, I recalled that a year ago when this bill was on the floor, he stood here in the well of the House and told us with vibrant voice about pitiful cases of cancer of the cervix in women, and when he talked about cancer of the cervix in women, this House fell in windrows.

Do you know that up to that time, and up to this time no cure has been found for cancer of the cervix in women except the surgeon's knife? We have made no progress whatever on cancer. We do not know what causes it. We have discovered no method of curing it except surgery when taken in time, and we knew that before the Government spent a dollar on research. And all this talk of what has been accomplished in curing cancer of the cervix is without foundation. Any doctor in Washington will tell you that.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of making a reasonable appropriation—even though chances of getting out of it are small, but why increase the amount over last year? The appropriation last year was more than they could spend, and money had to be turned back.

The one thing to be remembered here is that an organized lobby is pressuring Members of Congress and trying to make them believe there is a widespread demand for these increased appropriations back home. All these messages originate right here in Washington and are sent out to your district to give the impression that the demand is local and voluntary when they were systematically planted there to mislead the Congressman.

These lobbyists could get immediate and legitimate results if they would bring patients here who have been cured by Government research. Or affidavits from physicians who have used remedies developed by Government research. Why do they not bring in cancer cases that have been cured? Because there are no such cases. We know nothing

more about the cause and cure of cancer today than we knew before a dollar of Government money had been spent in cancer research.

Now if someone would just send word out there to the taxpayers and get them to express their views on the subject of excess, you would get evidence that would really throw some light on this question of large appropriations and taxes to pay larger appropriations.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I have taken very little time to talk on this bill, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I hate to get up again, but I feel I have to in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri because they show that he has not kept pace with research in the field of medicine. I have never made the claim that the Federal Government discovered penicillin, streptomycin, chloromycetin, cortisone or ACTH. The claim I did make was that after cortisone and ACTH were discovered, you had the problem of manufacturing it and getting it to the people at a price they could afford to pay. That is where the Federal Government came in. That is where we appropriated funds which saved many, many lives. There is one more answer I must make to the gentleman's statement. He claimed that last year I said we had found a new technique to discover cancer of the cervix in women at an early enough stage to cure it. That statement was correct and still is correct, contrary to what the gentleman from Missouri said.

Contrary to what the gentleman from Missouri has said, the new smear technique that is now being carried on in about 12 cities throughout the country has been effective. In Memphis, Tenn., where the first demonstration clinic was opened they examined 100,000 women. Through this technique it was discovered that 400 of them had cancer of the uterus, and it was discovered in time so that they have been cured, in the opinion of the best cancer doctors in the world.

If the gentleman from Missouri is going to refute that statement I ask him to get up on his feet and say so.

Mr. CANNON. I say again emphatically there is no cure for cancer, notwithstanding the millions that have been carried by this bill in past years. The gentleman is entirely mistaken about that. It is a cruel hoax to make the statement here when thousands are waiting for the cure the gentleman says has been discovered.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the point I made last year, and I make the point again today, is that through this method of diagnosis they have been able to diagnose cancer of the cervix in women early enough to cure it. The fact is

that these women are going to live who would not have lived if it had not been for the establishment of this clinic with Federal funds.

Mr. CANNON. The only cure is surgery, and our physicians and surgeons knew that before the gentleman was born.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman has lost most of his time yielding to others. I ask unanimous consent—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not stating a point of order.

Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not excited or mad at anybody, I would just like to have a little heart-to-heart talk with my colleagues here today.

I am a member of this subcommittee and deeply interested in these appropriations. I am not going to charge anybody with fiscal irresponsibility or with being fatuous or fat-headed—I think that is what fatuous means, fat-headed. Now, I am not going to charge anybody with that. You know I am one of you. I want to cut this budget. I was so staggered when it first came up here that I adapted a little nursery rhyme about it. It went something like this—and I sent it back home to my newspapers:

Hush, little budget, don't you cry;
You'll be a trillion by and by.

Mr. Bob Allbright, the able correspondent from the Washington Post and Times Herald, picked it up and published it in the Washington Post. And do you know what he said about me? He dubbed me as one of the "disillusioned leaders of the economy bloc." Now, I did my best to keep that from getting back home, but it did get back to my newspapers and radio stations in spite of all I could do. So I am just one of you and want to help you cut the budget.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. My distinguished colleague, and my friend, because I am very fond of him, was dubbed in last Sunday's paper as the leader of the economy bloc.

Mr. LANHAM. One of the leaders.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to ask him if the only item in this bill that is over the budget estimate was not put there at the gentleman's insistence?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; and I am proud of it. For it supplies the money for our rural-library program.

Mr. CANNON. That is the sort of economy the gentleman practices. The leader of the economy bloc put in this bill the only item above the budget estimate. It was not for disease. It was

for books—novels, comics, detectives—anything that might be requested at a public library. Economy with a vengeance.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. No; I cannot yield. I want to discuss ways and means by which we can cut some money out of this appropriation bill.

I think I got the reputation of being a leader of the economy bloc because of the fight I led on the floor of the House a few weeks ago to cut \$2 million in the supplemental appropriation bill. You folks over here on the left helped me and you folks over on the right helped me, but we have had an awful time holding that cut in another body as I told you the other day. However, I think eventually we are going to keep the cut in the bill. I have been doing everything I could to help cut this bill.

You know, the President made a statement yesterday and there are parts of it I think we ought to listen to. I am glad to see that the President is coming back now to champion his budget. I think he got frightened at all of the letters and telegrams that were coming in about the size of the budget so he abandoned the baby and went off to Bermuda. He has come back and he sees the baby is in hot water, he has come to his senses and he is trying now to justify his budget. In a way he does that. He said that this budget was carefully, intelligently prepared. He said that there may be cuts made in it here and there but that we are kidding ourselves and are fatuous or fat-heads if we think by the sort of cutting that has been going on on this bill we are going to really reduce the budget.

I think we ought to think about this fact. Most of the work of this body is done in committees.

Mr. Chairman, when I was a member of the Committee on Public Works, Mr. Will Whittington was chairman of that committee and I used to marvel at the man's knowledge of every little dam in this country, every river and creek. He knew exactly what the engineers were doing in every State in the Union. I marveled that one brain could hold all he knew. JOHN FOGARTY is like that on this committee. I have never seen a man with so much knowledge in the field of labor, health, education, and welfare. JOHN FOGARTY is as anxious as any of you to cut the budget where it can be done, as the President said, sensibly. Do you know that your committee spent weeks in hearings? We tried to determine as best we could how we could carry on the work in this most important field of human welfare at the lowest possible cost.

Over the years we have all voted for these programs. Think about this: Your Appropriations Committee has a sense of responsibility to the House. You voted for these programs and the Appropriations Committee feels that it should make these programs work at the lowest possible cost. In making up this budget that is exactly what your subcommittee did. Of course, we are not infallible, neither is any other committee. But it does seem to me that as far as

possible in our effort to cut the budget we ought to be very careful in what we do and put some confidence in your committee. And we ought to listen to this man who above all others knows what he is talking about in this most important field.

I am sorry that this concentrated effort to cut these little amounts out of the budget had to fall on this committee or in this field where the welfare of not only our children but the adults of our country who are suffering from disease, who are suffering from privation and want, are involved. I am sorry that we picked this field to make these cuts. They are not huge. They cannot be cut much, but, Mr. Chairman, I hope that as we go ahead with this appropriation bill today we will do so intelligently. If we are going to cut at all, let us cut down the number of employees, if it has to be done.

On that point, let me say this. By our indiscriminate cutting, where we, by our own legislation and by our own action have piled additional burdens upon them, we are hardly fair to our loyal Federal employees. Now, I know that we have too many in some instances. We tried to pare their number down, as we heard the testimony on this bill, in these fields. We have done our best, but are we not somewhat unfair to the employees who are trying to do a good job? Some of them, I know, may not be all they should, but by and large our Federal employees are loyal. They work hard. They do their jobs well, and I think we ought to think about them and we ought to be fair to our Federal employees and not cut them to the point that we ask those left to do an impossible job.

Now, I hope that as we go along we are going to do as the President says. I know every one of you wants to do what is right. I am sure you are not politically inspired, because the election does not come until next year, and the people are going to forget what you did this year, of course. I know it is not politically inspired at all, and I just hope that we are going to use our intelligence and that we are not going to use the "meat ax" approach. After all, the only cuts that can be very substantial and by which we can really hope to reduce the budget are in our foreign aid and our military expenditures. The President does not want to cut that, but he says even there we can cut to some extent.

Let me tell you, my friends, I am also on that subcommittee, and I think our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana, will tell you that we have done a good job of pruning. You know, he wields a wicked pruning knife, and when we come to that appropriation we will save you some money. You cannot save much here, but we will save you some money there, and I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], my distinguished friend and chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is going to be able to save a large amount in the military budget—up into the billions of dollars. But, let us not try to pile up these little savings here at the expense of this department and at the expense of the folks back home who are

the beneficiaries of these splendid programs. We used to call them new deal; we used to call them fair deal, but now some call them modern Republicanism; whatever you call them, the programs have been established by this Congress, and they have been continued by this Congress.

Now, let us try to be reasonable and sensible as we go ahead with the consideration of this bill, and I will guarantee you that we are going to cut a nice slice out of the foreign-aid bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The remarks of the gentleman from Georgia indicate that there were some cuts that could be made here on the floor as far as disease control is concerned. I do not believe we have come to that section of the bill yet, and I do not believe there will be any substantial cuts made in the facilities of the National Institutes of Health. I believe the amendments so far have been almost entirely to personnel services and not any of the activities of the National Institutes of Health, because we have not reached that part of the bill as yet.

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope we will be more careful than we have been in the Department of Labor. I do not know that these cuts we have made are going to hurt too much, but I think maybe some of them were unwise. But, as we go into this most important field, please let us be careful.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has been talking about personnel. Now, then, when the health services for Indians were transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Public Health Service, they transferred over some 3,750 employees from the Department of the Interior. The transfer was supposed to have been made in the interest of efficiency and economy, bringing the Indians under the United States Public Health Service. Lo and behold, we find that they have added 800 employees.

Mr. LANHAM. I am not too familiar with the Indian situation since I do not have even a cigar store Indian in my district. But I am sure that this health function was transferred to the Public Health Service because it was felt that the Public Health Service was the proper Service to handle it and would do the job that had to be done.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but we were supposed to get efficiency and economy; and instead they go 800 more employees.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is thinking about the Hoover Commission reports now and not about that transfer.

Mr. GROSS. I am thinking about those 800 more employees.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. As the author of the bill providing for the transfer of the health

service for the Indians to the Public Health Service, no promise or claim was ever made that it would save us money net. This was an attempt to clean up an utterly disgraceful situation, in which the medical care of our own Indians, for whom we have a peculiar responsibility, had become almost indescribable. We said at that time that it would cost more money. Our purpose was to get all of the health activities in the United States under one head so that the same agency that takes care of our health would take care of the Indians', and vice versa. We recognized that it would take more money. But we felt that it would be good economy, because these Indian reservations were becoming almost foci of infection which was spreading throughout the population.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. This subcommittee agrees with your thinking and has tried to give the Public Health Service the money to do a good job.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia. He is far more courteous than the distinguished chairman of the general Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LANHAM. He was just excited; I am not.

Mr. BAILEY. I cannot help but note the gentleman's [Mr. CANNON] comment that to eliminate a small amount like this for cancer control would reduce the cost of living. In my estimation, that kind of talk is pure hysteria and has no basis of sense.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Is it not a fact that when the Public Health Service took control of the health of the Indians, there were practically no health regulations for the Indians. They were dying like flies from tuberculosis. Since the Public Health Service has taken control, the death rate from tuberculosis among the Indians has almost reached the level of that of the other people of the United States. We have established hospitals and other facilities so that something is now being done for the health of the Indians.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure that is correct. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said on the subject of the Public Health Service research program. I am very much interested in that subject. Our subcommittee heard 185 witnesses. We took 1,700 pages of testimony. We were in session for practically a month from 10:00 a. m. until about 6 p. m. We heard some extremely important witnesses on this question.

Dr. Paul White, who was the specialist attending President Eisenhower fol-

lowing his heart attack, was one of the witnesses for the Heart Institute. Dr. Farber of the Massachusetts General Hospital testified concerning cancer research. The dean of the Johns Hopkins University medical school appeared before our committee. Leading authorities on mental health, arthritis, and so forth, appeared before us; and they presented the argument, supported by figures, that the amount of money provided for these research programs should be considerably greater than it is at the present time.

It is not fair to say to the medical researchers that we will spend a certain sum of money for cancer research only if you find a cure. Of course, no one can guarantee finding a cure in any kind of medical research. When Dr. Salk was given a prize for discovery of a polio vaccine, he said that he could not accept that reward for himself, but that it should be considered as a reward to all science; because what he achieved was built on the work of other men. I can assure you that the National Health Institutes work with every private society that raises funds for medical research. They work with other public authorities in their research effort. The representatives of the Cancer Society, the Heart Society, and the Mental Health Society, as I said before, all appeared before our committee.

Now about medical research by private industry: There is some talk about the fact that several million dollars of unused research funds are going to revert to the Treasury. What the Health Institutes had planned to do was to make contracts with the pharmaceutical companies to conduct research on chemotherapy for cancer. Many thousands of drugs were to be considered with the purpose of finding out which of these drugs might provide a cure or a deterrent in any way to cancer.

The Health Institutes found they were unable to place these contracts except on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, and for that reason they could not get the contracts approved by other Government authority. That is the reason this money is reverting to the Treasury.

So far as our research programs in connection with infectious diseases are concerned, they have made great headway. Tuberculosis is only about seventh the menace as it was when it once ranked as the leading killer. I heard one of the doctors concerned with this research says that they could not find a case of smallpox to exhibit to the medical students so they would know what it was. One of them told me he had not seen a new case of locomotor ataxia in 3 years. So the research in infectious diseases has gone a long way.

But more Americans will die of cancer this year than were killed in World War II. More men will die of heart trouble in the United States this year than have died in all the wars our country has fought.

I think any nation that can spend \$38 billion a year for defense and armaments—any nation that can carry on a research program whereby we can split the atom—can spend a comparatively

small sum of money for medical research. I think it is a great and worthwhile field. Like the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], I am only sorry more money has not been expended in this cause. I think we are seeing great progress on one of the finest programs the Government has.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman a few minutes ago in connection with a colloquy over the transfer of the Indian Health Service said something about the drop in the rate of tuberculosis among the Indians. Will the gentleman restate the figures?

Mr. DENTON. I do not have the figures here, but the percentage of reduction is sharp. They showed that when the Public Health Service took over this work the death rate of the Indians was very high from tuberculosis. That has been cut down now until it very nearly approaches the death rate of other people with tuberculosis.

Mr. GROSS. That transfer was made effective not more than 2 years ago.

Mr. DENTON. Then it was within 2 years' time.

Mr. GROSS. It was less than 2 years ago that the transfer was made.

Mr. DENTON. It was not much over 2 years ago.

Mr. GROSS. Can you drop the rate of tuberculosis in 2 years?

Mr. FOGARTY. It was just 2 years ago that these responsibilities were transferred to the Public Health Service from the Department of the Interior. At that time we found these conditions exactly as the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, has explained, in such a bad way that we said to the Public Health Service, "You are going to have the responsibility. We want you to go in there and do a good job." As a result we did give them additional personnel because of the conditions we found out there. In this year's budget we have not given them any more than we did in 1957. We did give them a jump last year because of the necessity to do something in this field.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CANNON, Mr. DENTON was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have just made some computation of what has been done as to reducing this appropriation in 2 days' time here, and we are going on a third. The actual amount of money that has been cut out of this appropriation is \$657,100. There have been "phony" cuts of a little over \$14 million in programs where existing law does not permit any real cuts by way of an appropriation bill. Probably most of this \$14-million cut will be restored when the bill gets to the Senate. When you get through, I doubt if you will have accomplished a great deal of real reduction, beyond what our committee recommended, on this whole appropriation bill. I wish we could get along with it.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the man who now heads the Indian Health and Welfare Service in the present department was also head of that same service when he was with the Interior Department on loan?

Mr. DENTON. No; I do not know that; but I do know that the Public Health Service now has charge of it, and you will find it is a commissioner service. It is a service with a very high esprit de corps. They have accomplished a great deal in the way of public health for all Americans. I think that so long as the Indians are wards of the Federal Government—and, after all, we did take their land away from them—we owe them decent care. We should treat them fairly, and they should have as good health facilities as the rest of the people of the United States have. All that was done was to give the Indians the same public health service that the rest of the people of the United States have.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that Dr. Shaw who previously headed this department in the Department of the Interior, appeared before the committee and he was very critical of his own work that he had been doing for years.

Mr. DENTON. I think there were about 185 witnesses before the committee, and I cannot remember them all.

Mr. HALEY. I think if it is as bad as he says it is, we ought to get somebody else to head up this work in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. DENTON. I am sure that I do not have anything to do with selecting their officials.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if there is any reason why we are discussing items in the bill that will not come up until tomorrow, and I wonder why we should not face the music as we go along here.

Mr. DENTON. Of course, the Public Health Service has been mentioned by the chairman of the committee in his discussion, and my remarks refer to some of the things he said.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me that we ought to get to work.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 150 words.

Mr. Chairman, we have had our hearts stirred now for about an hour and twenty minutes. We have had them stirred by general talk about the bill and particularly about the items that have not come up as yet. I am wondering if this is a filibuster. But, I am going to take just 5 minutes to try to stir your minds on a specific item found in this bill. The item is found on page 25, at the top of the page, and it is an appropriation of \$50 million to help municipalities to build sewage disposal plants—sewage disposal plants. That is the subject and the

amount is \$50 million. I have a motion at the Clerk's desk to strike out that \$50 million, but I have been told that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has the same motion. So, I am going to withdraw mine and let him have the credit for it. But I do want to argue a little bit for his motion.

Mr. Chairman, Oglesby, Ill., my hometown, has voted to issue \$500,000 worth of bonds to build a new school building, and \$350,000 worth of bonds to build a sewage-disposal plant. The people of Oglesby believe in standing upon their own feet and taking care of their own needs.

Mr. Chairman, the city of Oglesby has an efficient city government and a rather unusual city clerk. He hands out along with his monthly bills some of his economic and financial views. The following is an excellent sample—well worth citing:

Many American citizens justifiably alarmed and angered by high Federal taxes and a swollen Federal budget wonder what one citizen can do about it. The easy way would be to accept this bloated Washington business and do nothing about it. If you feel that your efforts would be puny, you are not a worthy descendant of the men who founded this Nation * * *.

It makes no sense for citizens or newspapers to talk out of both sides of the mouth about high Federal taxes. Some of us who were in city business 25 years ago—when the welfare state began during the depression—may have moments when we regret any requests that we made for Federal aid, but we at least had a depression. When WPA ended we put it behind us. It ill becomes some of our neighbor cities to be asking for Federal help to abate sewage pollution when their resources are equal or superior to those of Oglesby. We are at least paying our own way.

An ideal Congress would be one that would cease posing as world savers and shapers, operate as inexpensively as possible, spend time repealing legislation, go fishing frequently, and let the States and cities help themselves.

More city clerks should follow the example of Edward Hand, the city clerk of Oglesby, and more cities should be encouraged to stand upon their own feet, hoe their own row, and look after their own needs. If charity begins at home, so should municipal responsibility begin at home.

In order to help place municipal responsibility where it belongs we should cut out of this bill the \$50 million carried in it for municipal sewage disposal plants.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when one goes to the bedside of a desperately ill child there is no counting of pennies or figuring of how to balance the household budget. Over every home in our country is hanging the fear of visitation upon the loved ones in that home of one of the dread diseases for which there now is no cure. Medical research will find the cures and through medical research will come the lifting of the tormenting fears that plague us daily as we are shocked by the sudden taking of dear friends, victims of cancer, of heart and other fatal ailments.

I credit every Member in this House with the sincere desire to practice econ-

omy, and I think that desire comes from the honest intent to cut down the spending by this Government and thus to strengthen our country and to benefit our taxpayers.

I had hoped that in the field of medical research there would be a forgetting of the urge to cut. That urge to cut and cut into appropriations as deeply as is humanly possible, where the cutting is not at the sacrifice of our security or of our welfare, is a proper and highly commendable urge. But any cut in an appropriation for medical research, even to the extent of 1 cent, if such as well it might would halt our approach to the complete conquering of dreaded killer diseases, is no more to be considered than the counting of pennies at the bedside of a gravely ill loved one. This is a field in which there must be no diminution of our effort.

I have said many times in reporting to my constituents that the outstanding achievement of the 84th Congress was the medical-research program to which the people of this country and of the world will forever be indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. It was the greatest health-research program ever embarked upon by any nation in all the long history of the world. It was a program that looked forward to the conquering of all the frightful human ailments that are striking tragically into the homes of our country. It was a program that in its development meant to me that my life would be lengthened, and to every person now living the same assurance of a lengthened span of life. It was a program that, extended into the field of international relations, would give assurance of peace a thousand-fold greater than that of any other effort.

The Department of Defense of our country spends in excess of \$1 billion a year exclusively for research in weapons to kill and to protect against being killed. This billion dollars a year and more is exclusively for research. We have been spending that amount every year for quite a period and when the Secretary of Defense appeared before a committee of which I was a member and I asked him how long this expenditure of a billion dollars a year and more in research would continue, he answered it would continue as far into the future as was foreseeable.

Our program of health research has for its purpose, not the destruction of life, but the protection of human lives against ailments for which there are now no known cures but for which cures will come as certainly as day follows the night if the health-research program is not destroyed. The new medicines that we discover, the cures and the treatments, are made available not only to our own people but to the peoples of all the world. This is the sure way of reaching into the hearts and the minds of peoples in other lands. They have their loved ones and they have the same dread of killer diseases that strike into their homes as have we. When from the United States there comes into any land a medicine or a treatment that puts an

end to the reign of tormenting diseases, the friendship for us of the peoples of that land will be measured by the rule of the good Samaritan.

The men and women of the district in Chicago that I have the honor to represent, I am sure, do not wish me to vote for reducing by as much as one red cent the money that our Federal Government is putting into the health-research program. We are very proud in my district of the great contribution that the outstanding scientists and the renowned medical men at the University of Chicago are making to the program. It is in Chicago that one of our great merchant princes, his beloved brother having in his prime fallen a victim of cancer, is devoting his fortune and his driving genius to the fight to find the medical treatment that is bound, before many years have passed, to end the plague of cancer. Maurice Goldblatt, this merchant prince of Chicago, who is devoting his fortune and his time in this fight to end the plague that took his brother's life, is supported by an organization the headquarters of which are located in the Second District of Illinois.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I too have reason for a personal interest. That is in the emotion and the grief of a long-ago yesterday. I was the father of a little girl, my only daughter. One day going to school in play she fell and her head hit on the hard sidewalk. At that time medical science had no known cure. For 6 weeks I was at the bedside of the daughter of my pride and of my deep love, watching a beautiful flower fade. Nothing in the then knowledge of medicine could be done; and yet I knew that, in the years to come, with research, medicine would have found the cure. I do not want the grief and the loss that I experienced in that long-ago yesterday to come to any other parent when the cure that might have come from research did not arrive in time because I had voted to curtail a health-research program that would have found the cure.

There is no greater work in which this Government could be engaged than that of medical research to find the cures for dread killer diseases. Every penny we spend in such a program is a penny well spent. There is not a home in America today where the mother and the father sit with their children in the family circle, and always with the fear that one of the dread killer diseases might strike at that happy family circle, where there is any desire that we should practice economy at the price of taking from them the protection of that which in life is most precious to them.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking with emotion. I am certain it is an emotion no different from that that must be felt by every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle. It was only a few days ago that one of our former colleagues, the beloved Harold Hagan, only 55 years of age and apparently in the pink of condition, dropped dead with a heart ailment. It was not long ago that our colleague, Frank Keefe, was standing at the table where now stands the gentleman from Rhode Island, fighting every inch of the way as now JOHN

FOGARTY is doing, for an enlargement of our health research program. His last speech in this Chamber was for a larger appropriation, and I can see him in my memory now throwing into his speech every particle of his virile personality. Not many months afterward Frank Keefe, crossing the street in his home city in Wisconsin, dropped dead. Many in this Chamber were the warm personal friends of the distinguished son of Ohio who was affectionately known as "Mr. Republican." None realized when he was last a candidate for the presidency of the United States in the Republican Convention, that cancer already had seeded itself in him and that very shortly after the inauguration of President Eisenhower he was to pass to the life eternal, victim of a dread disease that can be conquered if we do not halt and drag our feet in the health research program upon which we have engaged.

Mr. Chairman, when the day comes, as soon it will if we are not faint of heart, that the reign of these dread killer diseases has ended, the name of JOHN FOGARTY will be blessed in every home in this and other lands. There is no Member of this body who is held by his colleagues in higher esteem or in warmer affection. In the 84th Congress, when we embarked upon the greatest health research program in all history, this Chamber rang with the loudest applause that I remember in tribute to the great American responsible for that program, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. The present debate has been long, motivated, I am sure, by a sincere desire on the part of everyone on both sides of the aisle to effect economy in Federal expenditures, but when the vote is taken on any amendment to weaken the health research program, if such amendment there should be, I am confident that the gentleman from Rhode Island will have proof that his labors to save mankind from the physical ills that plague it have the appreciation and the approval of his colleagues in this body.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, is not the regular order the reading of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraph by paragraph, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAUS OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$7,470,000.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: On page 11, line 7, strike out "\$7,470,000" and insert "\$7,124,000."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would bring about a reduction of \$250,000 in the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. My amendment would give this Bureau the entire amount it had in its budget for the present fiscal year, 1957, and in addition it would also add \$327,000 which is the mandatory contribution that this bureau must make to the retirement fund.

This reduction of \$256,000 is certainly justifiable because the increase of \$256,000 represents an expansion of present studies and programs with new or additional employees. This agency is concerned with the gathering of statistics, preparation of consumer price indexes and making various studies of employment, hours, earnings and labor turnover. I am quite familiar with the head of this bureau, Mr. Ewan Clague, who is a very capable, efficient, competent official. He has appeared before the House committee of which I am chairman on different occasions.

Now, I am sure that he can get along with the present number of employees. If my amendment is not approved, this Bureau will hire about 60 or 70 new employees for making expansion of certain studies on automation, consumers price index, and so forth. I cannot see why expansion of these various studies is justified by the employment of additional personnel. Certainly this Bureau can practice a little more economy and tighten its belt and get along on the same appropriation for the next fiscal year that it has for the present fiscal year. I appeal to you to support the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, the people of this country want expense reduction. I do not think there is any Member of this House who questions that. Certainly we have heard from the grassroots. We may have heard from some pressure groups, but by and large it is the grassroots we have been hearing from.

I happen to have had a questionnaire but without a specific question about reduction of expense. However, this great pile of hundreds of letters have come in on their own, specifically and emphatically demanding expense reduction, many of them enclosing clippings and documents.

I would like to suggest to this body that we are the voice of the people; that it is time we express the words of the people and the words of the various memorials of our State legislatures and city governments. Yes, I know the Congress voted many of these projects, but the projects and the bureaus are mushrooming, and they have been doing so.

May I suggest that authorization of all of them does not necessarily mean automatic appropriation. Authorization does not mean automatic appropriation. History is full of these exceptions where we have voted to approve something, but we have heard from the people and we have refused to appropriate the money. Now, that can be done again and again. Capital expenses do not have to be repeated. Nonrecurring expenses do not have to be repeated. Projects can be deferred. Much payroll can be saved by way of attrition. The people want reductions. This bill as a whole can result in greater expenditures than the administration requested, because there are in the bill, as you know, about 5 headings which have by law to be requisitioned, and the \$118 million suggested cut from the requested budget by the committee, can easily be eaten up. There is \$90 million that has been called a phony reduction. Maybe it is a reduction—and we hope it is—but it could be an increase-plus item. In that case we shall, if we vote the committee's bill, even vote an increase instead of decrease.

So, we have got to hold the line to last year, and that is what the maker of this amendment suggests.

I suggest no reflection on the very able head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. Clague. He is an able and conscientious public servant. There is no denying that. But, in 1956 they spent \$6,407,000. We increased it \$485,000 for 1957. Now we are asked to increase it \$583,000 more. But when we add back the provision for the retirement fund, it can be adjusted to the amendment as it is.

May I suggest, also, that we might do some improving in what we are spending the money for. I have here two very well gotten up, thorough volumes of the directory of labor organizations of Europe. I asked for a directory of the independent labor unions of the United States. We must realize that the spokesmen for some members of our Government are speaking in behalf of the CIO and the AFL. They ignore the vast number of independent unions, which have more than 5 million members I am told, and the 45 million unorganized workers. And yet we do not have enough money in the budget, I am told, for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to get out a small directory of our own independent unions; but we can put out these publications on European labor unions.

There are special studies, and there are continuing studies, but some can be adjusted. It is provided here that there will be a number of more employees in this expansion. Let me reiterate. I have the most wholesome respect for the head of that Bureau, but I am sure in this case, just as in a number of other cases, that we can take up this slack, and convince the people of this country that we are endeavoring to hold the line. This still gives them an increase, but they can make these exceptions and substitute some programs which do not have to be continuing. I support the gentleman's amendment to reduce the budget back at least to last year's expendi-

tures plus the retirement fund adjustment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boggs). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, when the Bureau of Employees Compensation got by without any suggested cuts from my friends on my left, I thought maybe the press conference of the President on yesterday had had some effect on the piecemeal budget cuts you have been operating on here for the last couple of days. But now I see that you have passed that one over and we have come to the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and I notice that you are back at it again.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I thought this amendment was offered by a Member on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was, but the majority of the votes for it are going to come from your side of the aisle.

Mr. JONAS. That remains to be seen.

Mr. FOGARTY. I hope the gentleman is right, because then I will be sure that the President had some effect on you and your leadership in the chastisement that he gave you yesterday in the papers. From the New York Times article apparently the Eisenhower Republicans were beginning to believe that the President had deserted them and they were very pleased to find that he had come out and taken a definite stand on the budget now. But the orthodox Republicans were kind of glum and grumpy, as I read the New York Times this morning, at the revelation of the President's standing by his guns and accusing the leaders of this economy bloc of "fatuous and foolish" cuts in a budget that was arrived at intelligently by him and all his people in the administration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the gentleman really thinks that this cut would impair the operations of the Department. I gathered from the fact that he has proceeded thus far on generalities that he does not feel that that would be the result.

Mr. FOGARTY. I happen to be in a good mood today, knowing that the President had said yesterday at his press conference what we Democrats have been saying for 2 days. I do not know whether or not he has been following the Committee's recommendations here or the debate that has been doing on. But the statements that were made by those of us who have been supporting the Committee's stand for the past 2 days were practically reiterated by your President and my President at his press conference yesterday. And I assume he is still your leader as he is the President of the United States, and is of your political faith.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have not been able to figure out whether the gentleman from Rhode Island or the President is indulging in wishful hoping.

Mr. FOGARTY. We both are at this time, and as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] said, we will see. There will be a division and we will see who stands up in support of the President's programs.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I was trying to get to the effect that this cut will have.

Mr. BUDGE. I simply wanted to comment, in regard to the gentleman's remarks concerning the statements of the President of the United States, that there is another subcommittee on which the gentleman and I serve, and he will recall that when the budget was presented on yesterday, the first announcement, in connection with the Civil Functions Budget was that it was cut \$13½ million by order of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FOGARTY. By the President.

Mr. BUDGE. I think that would show the attitude of the President perhaps more than a statement which was not directed at the action of this House.

Mr. FOGARTY. He seemed to imply yesterday that those of you who voted for that huge public-works authorization last year, to authorize public-works projects without having detailed plans and specifications, were doing it for political purposes. If I remember correctly, that vote was substantially high on both sides of the aisle. I suppose he was accusing those who voted for that pork barrel bill a year ago of doing it only for political purposes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. May I ask the gentleman from Idaho, is it not a fact that the \$13,500,000 recommendation to cut the public works civil functions bill comes from the President in this instance? Is that not so?

Mr. BUDGE. That is so.

Mr. BOLAND. Is it not so that you are doing the cutting on the floor here? The cuts here are not recommended by the President.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me tell you what this amendment will do. It will cut out \$100,000 for the initiation of a continuing program of consumer expenditure surveys to assist in insuring that the Consumer Price Index is valid. That is one of the most important things we have today. It is something that business, labor, and management, are dependent upon. The wages of 4 million workers are dependent upon the accuracy and the availability of this consumers' price index. Today a rise of one-half a point in the cost of living means an annual wage increase to 4 million people of \$80 million. That is only one thing you are cutting out by this amendment. It would also cut out funds for the initiation of a 3-year program to shift the employment, hours, earnings, and labor turnover data to the new standard industrial classification system in order

that these statistics may be comparable with statistics which are published elsewhere in the Government; \$50,000 for statistical analysis of some of the problems affecting older workers; and \$120,000 for the analysis of the effects of tariff changes on United States employment.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended a modest program increase for this Bureau, which provides the facts and figures on which the people of this country have come to rely. I wonder if the Members of the House really understand how much the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics mean to the working people and to the business concerns of this country. For example, right now the wages of millions of workers in this country are tied automatically to the Consumer Price Index. A single point change in this index can mean a rise or fall of \$160 million in annual payrolls. Think how important it is, both for working people and for their employers, to be confident that this index is as sound and is accurate as it can be made. Management and labor have shown their confidence in the Bureau by negotiating long-term contracts based on its figures. Such contracts couldn't be written without this index. Can you imagine the chaos which might result if people's confidence in these figures is shaken? What about the industrial disputes that might result? Might not the stability we have had in labor-management relations during recent years be upset?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 92, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here now for a couple of days. While I have been reluctant to say anything in connection with this bill, noting the trend and the fact that this is an administration bill, I am disturbed at some of the comment regarding the influx of mail and the great demands that are being made on every Member of this House. Particularly was I struck with the statement of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a short time ago when he announced that he had five telephone calls or wires this morning.

May I say to the House that I represent a fairly large district. It ranks up among the 12 largest in the Congress. I think my Minnesota colleagues will agree that I represent a very diversified district. I have a large number of the wealthiest people in the State of Minnesota in my district, I represent several labor wards, and in between those two groups is, of course, the so-called unorganized white collar wage earners, or perhaps we might call them the great mass of middle-class people.

To be honest with you, this may invite some challenge or it may invite some

mail, but I want to be very frank and honest to tell you, I have been here in Congress long enough now so that most of the people in my district know who represents them in the House of Representatives. I have received not over 12 letters and telegrams requesting or demanding that I vote on this budget. Those, let us say 12 telegrams, do not come from the great mass of people in my district. Therefore, I sit here quite convinced that I am on safe ground in voting as I have on most of the appropriations in this particular bill, because this is the particular bill that affects more people in my district than any other appropriation bill. But, there is nothing much that can be said to resist the temper of the House. This is not new to me. I have seen this trend in this direction before, and I will be very happy, indeed, when election time rolls around to meet this situation that some of you term as a very necessary position to take. I do not stand here and describe this bill as not being out of line insofar as the size of it is concerned. I think it is exorbitant. But, the cuts and the meat ax are used in places in this bill where I think they are less necessary. I am waiting patiently for a couple of other bills to come out. I want to see the agricultural bill come out and see what the Committee on Appropriations does to that as well as some other appropriation bills here. I have voted up until this bill for most of the economies in the five previous appropriation bills, but this bill hits the American people. So maybe tomorrow I will get a few more asked-for letters, but I want to say that at present in my files I have not over 12 demands or requests for me to participate in the cutting of provisions in this bill that so seriously affect the lives, the health, and welfare of 75 percent of the good folks in my district.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am in an entirely different position to the previous speaker. I will be very happy to pass some of my mail along to him. I find it quite arduous to answer all of the mail I have received with reference to this budget. My people are definitely of the middle class and represent small business. They want this budget cut. Today I received a letter from one of my good constituents enclosing a letter from the Surgeon General. In this letter he says:

A short time ago I wrote asking your cooperation in a study of the effect of tobacco on health now being conducted by the Public Health Service. A questionnaire concerning the use of tobacco was enclosed with my letter. Most of the persons to whom I wrote have returned a completed questionnaire. Your reply, however, has not been received.

Mr. Chairman, this questionnaire consists of four closely typewritten pages. It asks you about your mother and your father and whether she had shingles and whether he had hives. It goes on to ask you how much tobacco you use and why you use it, and when you stopped using it, and so forth. My constituent is indignant, as each one of these question-

naires is sent out in a postage-free envelope. My constituent says in his note to me, and I think he is justified, Mr. Chairman:

It is time to put the ax to this sort of thing—and not a rubber ax like was used in connection with the budget for this department.

And my constituent signs his name. Mr. Chairman, that is typical of a great many letters I am receiving. I think the questionnaire is also typical of a great deal of the money that is being spent at the present time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the questionnaire inquires as to the color of your hair and the color of your eyes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think the gentleman will find questions here covering everything that could possibly be said about any individual—a question about the color of his or her eyes and hair as well as a description of his ancestors.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently, this points up one of the things that is growing up in the Government and that is making more work for more jobholders.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I can imagine that this necessitates a great many hours of time to file these questionnaires and keep track of those who have not answered.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just listened with great interest to the letter read by the gentlewoman from New York. I am not a doctor, neither am I a medical scientist. I do not know whether the questions asked were pertinent or not. I presume they must have been pertinent to the rising incidence of lung cancer which is growing at an alarming rate, especially in men in this country because of the increase in smoking.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I tell the gentleman that some of the questions are impertinent?

Mr. FOGARTY. I was just going to give the gentlewoman an example of medical questioning. About 4 years ago I had one of those attacks that the President had, your President and my President, a coronary thrombosis. I was fortunate enough to have the advice at that time of a man who is one of the best heart specialists in the world, Dr. Paul Dudley White, of Boston. He dropped in to see me at the naval hospital the first week I was there, which is the most critical time in any heart case, as it was in the President's. Some of the questions he asked me I thought were impertinent; but coming from a man with the medical reputation of Dr. White, who was I to challenge the type of questions he asked? He asked me whether I ever had a broken leg, or a disjointed finger, and things of that

nature and there were other questions the doctor put to me that I could have thought were impertinent. But I thought that if he was a man qualified enough to take care of the President why should I resent the questions he asked me?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I presume the gentleman had asked for Dr. White's advice, that the doctor did not come gratuitously to the gentleman and ask a lot of questions.

Mr. FOGARTY. It just so happens that he came gratuitously to me but I felt that I was very fortunate to have him there and accepted his examination, both verbal and physical, without question.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman is very fortunate indeed.

Mr. FOGARTY. He was attending a Heart Association meeting in Washington. I was under the care of the naval hospital. He came out there, having heard I was there, and asked me these questions. It was not at my invitation that he arrived. But since he was good enough to interest himself in my problem, I thought I owed him the courtesy of answering his questions.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am glad the gentleman did not have a fatal illness.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind concern and I assure her that I am in excellent shape and expect to be around for many years to come.

The Clerk read as follows:

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$462,000.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BLITCH: On page 11, line 12, strike out "\$462,000" and insert "\$403,000."

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would hold appropriations for the Women's Bureau to the same amount they had this year. In other words, it eliminates the increase of \$59,000 provided in the bill reported from the committee.

I think it rather interesting that this increase is to be used for the creation of four \$7,570 per year positions plus two clerks. At a time when the Secretary of Defense is cutting employment, the House subcommittee is putting the heat on all departments to reduce their payroll, and the general feeling exists that we must economize, we should take a close look at any requests for additional Federal employees.

These six employees requested by the Department of Labor are to be used for field work. Just what is this field work going to consist of? According to the Director of the Women's Bureau, they will "coordinate, expand, and develop the women's affairs program of the department."

That is found at page 244 of the hearings.

Now, what expansion is contemplated for next year? Listen to this:

There is an increasing need—

And these are the words of the Director—

There is an increasing need for adequate counseling and guidance materials for young people who are about to choose a career, and a need for liberalizing the State minimum wage laws and orders affecting women workers.

That is the testimony of the Director. These four field workers are apparently going to be lobbyists in the several States because she goes further and states flatly:

They will work in the minimum wage field, they will work for equal pay in the States.

They will work for equal pay in the States.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what our feeling is about equal pay for equal work, it seems to me this is a ridiculous situation when the Federal Government hires people to lobby for State laws. It is foolish for us to put more employees on the payrolls so that they can meddle in the internal affairs of a State.

By adopting this amendment we have an opportunity to run up a warning signal to the Executive agencies to curtail some of their questionable activities. Again, I emphasize that my amendment does not cut the appropriation for this bureau below the current year's figure and, if adopted, the money available next year would be the same as they are operating on this year.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

Mr. Chairman, you are going to have a chance to have your vote recorded in the permanent record on this one, too, if it carries. There are 22 million women working in the labor force today. By 1965 they expect there will be another 5 million or about 27 million workingwomen in the labor force in our country.

When we were in the last war we appealed to the women of this country to go into the shipyards, the airplane factories and other industries. The only agency in the Government that they could turn to was the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor. There is not any agency in the entire Government just interested in working conditions, hours, or anything else, as far as the women of this country are concerned, with the exception of this Bureau right here.

What does the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia do? She says this cuts it back to what they had in 1957. That is not so. We are getting that same statement time after time after time. Because of the increase in mandatory costs that they are required to pay in 1958, the gentlewoman by her amendment is going to cut them by over \$20,000 below what they had in 1957 which means that they will have to discharge at least 4 employees they have at the present time.

Mrs. BLITCH. In the hearings, in the gentleman's own words, he asked the

Director if this is for new employees and she said "Yes."

Mr. FOGARTY. Not the entire amount she asked for. There is over \$20,000 of mandatory increases that will have to be appropriated to keep the same level of employment that we have now. The adoption of this amendment will mean that the Women's Bureau will have to decrease its employment by at least 4, and probably more than that. The bill provides for 4 more positions plus the mandatory increases which the gentlewoman did not take into consideration when she offered the amendment.

You can do what you want with this amendment, but they are doing, I think, fine work. For instance in our practical nurses' program, in attempting to get more girls to go into the field of nursing where there exists the greatest shortage we have in the medical field. If anyone is suffering from an acute illness that needs a nurse around the clock, 3 nurses a day, 24 hours, it is almost impossible to hire nurses. This is one of the jobs they are doing.

I think the gentlewoman from Georgia is just mistaken in offering this amendment because of the facts I am giving her. This is one agency where the women of this country can go for help or information.

The gentlewoman has offered an amendment to cut out the increase and cut out at least four persons that they have on the payroll. That is what the amendment amounts to. So, if you want to do that, that is what you are going to vote for, and you are decreasing the department by that much. They are also doing a good job in connection with the problem of the mature woman worker. That is one of the biggest problems that we have today, of mature women finding jobs. There are some executives that say that a stenographer over the age of 32 or 33 should not be hired. Well, this Women's Bureau is proving that that is a fallacy; that women aged 35, 40, 45, or 55 can still turn out a good day's work, and they are going to do a good job to help the mature women of this country to gain employment, but they need more people instead of less.

The Women's Bureau is requesting only \$462,000—the smallest appropriation item in the bill. This amount will enable them to add 4 field representatives and to bring their total staff to 61. The staff of this Bureau today is the same size that it was in the thirties, but women in the labor force have increased over 50 percent. This is the only bureau in the Federal Government to serve the 22 million women who are in the labor force today, and to give them the services which will help them find suitable jobs and prepare themselves for them.

The cost of living today, the increased demand for extended education of children, and the increase in the numbers of older dependents have made it a necessity more than a choice, for women to work.

The vast majority of them work to support themselves and others who are at least partially dependent upon them. In addition, the special skills which women possess are absolutely necessary to the

maintenance and continued expansion of the United States economy, and its high standard of living; we could not as a country serve our people without the women who are teachers, nurses, librarians, social workers, stenographers, clerks, waitresses, and who are in a host of other kinds of work which women have shown themselves most capable of performing.

Now the Labor Department estimates that more than 5 million women will be added to the working force by 1965. This increase will come largely from the older and younger age groups. This increase will be necessary to meet the growing manpower shortage. If these women are to prepare to enter the occupations where they are most needed, and be ready for this change, they have to know the facts about job opportunities, and they have to know about the training and skills that are required. Employers, too, must have the information which this Bureau can give them, about the types of jobs women can fill and how best to use their services, so they can solve their problems to keep their businesses sound and successful.

The Women's Bureau is the agency with the widest range of contacts with women in all fields. They have the facilities to gather and coordinate information on women's employment, but must be able to make it available to those who need the data. They must be able to visit the widely separated areas of the country to a much greater extent than they can now.

With the four new field representatives the Bureau could work closely with the regional and field staffs of the other bureaus of the Department and with local agencies in coordinating, expanding, and developing a broad but unified program for the women workers of the country. They would emphasize programs for older workers and for minimum wage and equal pay for women workers, and would look into job opportunities. In their contacts with local groups they would be able to assist in overcoming certain occupational shortages.

The increase is \$59,000, which provides for mandatory increases of \$31,362 and a net program increase of only \$27,638. The returns to the working women of the country would justify this amount in view of the future needs in the field of womanpower.

I feel very strongly that this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This particular agency was pretty good in getting people on its payroll. They had 57 in the budget and now they have 60. They did pretty good at that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know for certain, but I expect they have 3 or 4 that are paid from other funds to do special work for some other Government agency. But this amendment would set them back to fewer than they had in 1951.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mrs. BLITCH: Strike out "\$462,000" and insert "\$431,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this takes care of the objection entertained by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and this substitute will do exactly what the gentleman from Georgia has in mind, and that is to put the level of this particular agency down to the level of the 1957 fiscal year. That is all it accomplishes.

Mrs. BLITCH. I accept the substitute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute does not meet my objections. Let us keep the record straight. I object to any cut at all on this item. I am in favor of protecting the rights of these women and giving them the services they deserve and will be denied by this amendment. I am going to stick by them and defend them, because I think there should be some place in the Government where they can go to get help when they need it. Here is an item amounting to \$400,000 out of an overall total of \$71 billion. Here we are trying to decrease one of the smallest agencies in the Government and the only agency that deals just with the problems of the women of this country, especially the workingwoman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that it is the responsibility of the Congress to appropriate funds and not the responsibility of the President?

Mr. FOGARTY. Certainly it is.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely it is.

Mr. FOGARTY. But it is also up to the President to assume some leadership.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yet it is fundamentally the responsibility of the Congress to decide as to the amount of appropriations. This Congress should stand upon its own feet.

Mr. FOGARTY. I remember last fall there were not many of you over there denying his support. You all wanted your pictures taken with him so that you could show them in the campaign. You Republicans on the other side of the aisle were not disclaiming his leadership like that prior to the last election.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman violates the rules of the House when he refers to Members on this side as "you."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not understand what the change is now. Why are you different now than you were last October or September? It is hard to comprehend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely mistaken

in that matter. I did not have my picture taken with the President at any time. I ran 7,000 votes ahead of the President in my congressional district. I am standing on my own feet.

Mr. FOGARTY. You are an outstanding example, then, in this country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. He himself is a splendid Congressman.

Mr. FOGARTY. You are one of the very few who ran ahead of the President on your side of the aisle. I think that is a fair statement. But those of you who did have your picture taken with him must have thought that he was going to do you some good. You were out telling the people last year that you were part of his team because you knew there were votes to be had by associating yourselves with the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I again make the point of order that the gentleman is violating the rules of debate in the House. The gentleman must refer to other Members in the third person.

Mr. FOGARTY. How should I refer to the other gentlemen?

Mr. HOFFMAN. As Members of the House or distinguished gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on the point of order and say that the rules of the House provide that one Member refer to another Member in the third person.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I certainly would refer to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] as distinguished. Certainly he is distinguished, as he ran 7,000 votes ahead of the President in his district.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I might say that the gentleman has never referred to me other than in the most kindly fashion.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right; and as he has always been most considerate of me. I hope we shall always continue on those terms. I hope that the President's remarks of yesterday will have some effect as we go through this bill. It seems to me it had some little effect when you agreed to modify an amendment that I was not in favor of in any way, shape, or form. It perhaps had some effect, even though you did run ahead of the President 7,000 votes in your district.

Mr. Chairman, I renew my request that the amendment to the amendment be defeated and that the amendment itself be defeated. With such a huge budget as we have before us, this is a very small item but very important, because it effects 22 million women who are working in industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 107, noes 77.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$10,888,000.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT: On page 11, line 23, after "Division," strike out "\$10,888,000" and insert "\$10,600,000."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, it is only on rare occasions that my voice is raised in the well of this House. If you will indulge me for a minute I think it would be proper for me to say why I do rise here today.

We have heard a great deal of philosophical discussion this morning. At times I was of the opinion a little politics was being indulged in. But I want to tell you the reason I am here now to offer this particular amendment, and I shall have another amendment during the course of the consideration of this bill.

I am now in my 17th year as a Member of this body, and this is the first time in those 17 years that I have come to the well of this House and offered an amendment to an appropriation bill. The reason I am impelled to do what I am doing now is because of an action I took only recently in this House when I was 1 of 3 Members on my side of the aisle who voted against the resolution to ask the President to tell us where the budget could be cut. I think it also significant that on that same occasion I voted against the resolution offered from the other side of the aisle, because it is my deep feeling that it is our responsibility to provide the appropriations for the operation of Government agencies in this country. Having voted that way, I could do no less than discharge the responsibility which I publicly accepted by that vote.

Since coming to this body, I have pursued a course for independence which defies partisan conformity. I do not say that in a spirit of bravado but only with a humble appreciation of the most fortunate position in which I find myself. The fickle god of politics whose whims direct the destiny of most of us, has been kinder to me, perhaps, than to some of you, so I do not impugn your motives or challenge your actions at any time.

After all, we are the keepers of our own conscience. We are beholden to nobody but ourselves. So, I do not dangle in front of you such loose words as "votes" or charge any of you with irresponsibility. Each of you have a problem and each of you must resolve that problem. I am not impressed with statements made from both sides of the aisle about elections. I would rather approach this subject in a cold, logical

fashion. I respect the President of the United States—your President and my President. But, I accept his recommendations merely as recommendations. He discharges his responsibility in coming to us with a budget. I accept his recommendations in the same spirit that I accept the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations when they come to the House of Representatives as a whole with their recommendations, and particularly with reference to this subcommittee. If I did not pause at this moment to say something about the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], I would feel there would be a vacuum in my remarks. We both came to the House of Representatives 17 years ago. We were, as you recall, two freshmen in the same class. Only 10 of us remain of that class. I am heartened by the words which have been uttered in his praise. As I told him only yesterday, I do not envy the position in which he finds himself. But, he is doing a job as he sees his duty to do it and he should receive the compliments of this body from both sides. He demonstrated yesterday his complete impartiality when he frankly told you that he did not agree with a certain provision of this bill, but since it was the law it was his duty to provide funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. So, Mr. Chairman, I pause to pay tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to compliment him. He probably is one of the best informed Members of the House on the subject of appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, may I indicate the exact approach to this amendment and the amendment which I shall offer at a later time. This is no meat-ax approach. This is no wild wielding of the knife of economy. I subscribe to what the illustrious gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said on the opening day of debate on this bill. I subscribe to his philosophy and accept his formula. In offering this amendment, all I am doing is asking you to hold the line—nothing more and nothing less. As we respect the opinion of the President of the United States, we respect the opinion of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. But, in the final analysis, it is our duty to either accept or to reject what they offer us. If it is not our responsibility and not our duty, why then should they come here? Why would not the authority be delegated to them and let the matter end there. It is because we are charged with the responsibility to review what they recommend that we are debating this issue today. In offering this particular amendment, I am only asking that the department involved do what every Member of this House is going to have to do—except those of us who have outside income—we are going to have to exist next year and the year after that on our salaries even though the labor in-

dex shows that prices are going up and the prices of goods and commodities and what-have-you are all going up. But, we will have to tighten our belts and pull our belts in one more notch and get along this year with what we got along on last year. That is all I am asking in this particular amendment. I am merely asking that the Wage and Hour Division get along this year not only on what they got along with last year, but I am putting a little sugar in the kitty for them—last year they received an appropriation of \$10 million and spent some \$586,000 more. This year they are asking for \$10,888,000 and all I am doing is cutting it back to what they spent last year, and adding \$16,000 in case they spend a few extra dollars.

That is all it is. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, that is not a meat-ax approach; that is a sensible, sound, logical approach to a perplexing and complex problem. Your wires have to get along on the same budget this year that they got along on last year. I am asking you to apply the same yardstick to this Wage and Hour Division.

These programs are fine programs. Perhaps they need some expansion, but this is not the time. Perhaps you need a new kitchen in your home, but this is not the time. You have to wait. We have to determine to economize somewhere along the line and halt this excessive spending which is destroying the economic stability of this country.

So I ask you to adopt this amendment which, as I say, merely cuts the Wage and Hour Division back to exactly the figure it operated on last year with the addition of a few extra dollars.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I certainly respect the opinion and motives of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, but I think he has not made it quite clear that his amendment is directed specifically to 321 people.

His amendment would mean that 321 people who were hired last year with the understanding that if they completed a full year of satisfactory service they would get the moderate increase from \$4,525 a year to \$5,440 a year. These are people who are charged with the responsibility of going out in the field and talking to individual employers and to management. Certainly you want to get the best kind of people for that very personal and very important work.

If this cut is made it will undoubtedly mean that these people will resign and the Department will have to hire brand-new people without the experience and without the caliber of these people who were induced to work with the understanding that they would have this most moderate increase.

I agree that this is not a meat-ax cut; this is a very thin, but a very sharp knife, and I do not believe that anybody in this House wants to deny to these people this moderate and well-earned increase, because they do not get it if they have not earned it. I certainly hope that, in the words of the President, this very small amount will not be passed in the name of economy when it would

not be economy but merely bad management for the Government to have to undergo that kind of cut.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I direct the gentleman's attention to the reason given for the increase. It was not because of an increase of salary but for an expansion of existing programs.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir. If the gentleman will refer to page 314 of the hearings, he will find a total increase of \$880,000. Two hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars is applied to the increase that is necessary to pay this increased wage, and the gentleman will find that no new people are being put on.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman there that he is very clever and very adroit in singling out this particular item. He could run through the entire hearings and single out any amount and apply it to that particular item. If I made the cut apply to the \$880,000 item, the gentleman would probably apply it to some other thing.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. The gentleman will find there is no expansion of the program provided for.

Mr. HÉBERT. It says specifically that this is for an expansion of the program.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; it says for carrying out the program as it had been expanded and adopted in the field of minimum wages. There is not one single expanded piece of program that is undertaken, and the gentleman cannot find where it says there is.

Mr. HÉBERT. If the gentleman will read the testimony—

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have read it. Point it out to me.

Mr. HÉBERT. I, too, have read it; and I say it provides for an expanded program.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I wish the gentleman would point it out to me, and I say flatly no one can find any such statement in the record.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I find that, in the tables of employment, only 1,452 out of 1,535 are on the rolls as of the 28th day of February and that in all probability the same lag will occur there as would occur in other places. I am wondering why it is, with that lag in funds that would be provided, they could not take care of their people? Frankly, it seems to me they could.

Mr. FOGARTY. In answer to the gentleman from New York, this is just the average figure that all Government agencies take into account. It is the 5-percent figure and if you multiply 5 by 1,500 you will come out about even. They are up to just about the amount

they ought to be, taking into consideration that 5-percent figure.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the most able chairman of the subcommittee.

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much talk about cutting down the hiring of new Government employees. But the program to which this amendment relates does not contemplate adding any new Government employees at all.

The increase is made up of the mandatory figures, of course, under the new accounting system now being used and, as you will understand, this will come up time and time again in appropriations for each of the agencies. Formerly the Government contribution to the civil-service retirement fund was provided for all agencies in a single appropriation in the independent offices appropriation bill. Now each agency must pay into this fund a certain sum of money just as private employers do under the social-security program. That sum here is \$516,000. There is an extra day's pay involved which calls for \$33,000.

The proposed amendment would decrease the appropriation below what was approved last year; it would decrease the appropriation by \$261,000. This increase in the present bill is allowed because of the regulations that give employees extra pay for a longer length of service. That is the \$232,000. This increase that you have here is for retirement pay, the extra day's pay, and \$232,000 for their length-of-service benefits. This amendment proposes to cut that sum.

Here is an agency that collects more money on behalf of our citizens than it spends. They have been finding \$11 million or \$12 million a year in back wages due people from employers who have not been giving full pay to employees who are covered by the wage-and-hour law. This is the agency that makes the investigations to enforce the wage-and-hour law. I want to point out that that wage-and-hour law passed by a tremendous majority in this House, but it is of very little value to have such a law on the statute books unless you have adequate machinery to enforce it.

The proposed amendment would destroy the morale in this agency. These enforcement officers have contemplated that they were entitled to a raise because of length of service. With this amendment, either the Department is going to have to lay off men in this division when they need them more than at any other time, or else the employees will not get their due pay benefit. It may seem a small thing, but it would destroy the morale of a very important agency which in effect makes money for the public in its operations. This amendment would cause the agency to cut back its collection work and thus cause loss of money to the public.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman, is it not true that the Wage and Hour Division hired 321 new people after we raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to a dollar?

Mr. DENTON. I do not have that figure, but I think they did. That was last year, of course.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That was last year.

Mr. DENTON. That was last year when a new minimum-wage law went into effect and the agency found more violations, of course, than they had before. The percentage of establishments which they investigate is still very small.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. For the first year after the minimum wage increase there will probably be more policing necessary and more violations which will be prosecuted. Does not the gentleman agree with me that after a year or a year and a half of an increase in the minimum wage being in effect, there should be some drop in this Department?

Mr. DENTON. It would depend upon the economic condition of the country. If there is a great deal of unemployment, then, of course, you would need more men to enforce the minimum-wage law. If times are good you would not need so many. During wartimes, when there is a scarcity of manpower, of course, we do not need nearly so many investigators in the Wage and Hour Division. But, a good many of us come from districts where there are depressed areas. These areas of unemployment are spreading now, and in those circumstances we need effective enforcement of this law.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In relation to the question put by the gentleman from Arizona, may I point out that no fewer than 18,461 out of a total of 33,148 establishments that were visited in 1956 by these investigators were found to be in violation, and they did not even begin to scratch the surface of the job that has to be done, so that it will take a considerably longer period before they really catch up with their work.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman from California. That points up this problem.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, not knowing too much about this particular situation, I must be guided to some extent by what our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], has to say. Since he came here 17 years ago it has been my privilege to know him and his record, and if there is in the House a more independent, sound thinking Member, one more conscientious in the performance of his duty, I hope to meet him tomorrow or before the day is over. It will be difficult to find such a one. Always he has expressed his opinion. Always it has been based upon his convictions. I have

never seen any indication—and usually I know something about what is going on while I am on the floor—I have never seen any indication, not the remotest indirect hint, that any of his votes were influenced by any political consideration. He is an ideal legislator.

Now, having said that, and with apologies, permit me to refer to what was said by some of those who oppose this amendment. I know one rotten apples does not spoil the whole full barrel. True enough. The gentleman who just left the floor was talking about investigations. Sure, the Department of Labor was created to look after the interests of the people who work, especially in industry, and that is, of course, as it should be. But, one thing you can say about some of their investigators—that is, you could at least 3 or 4 years ago—often they were formerly officers in some union and they are very, very enthusiastic in making their investigations, which again is all right. But again some of these investigators go a little too far, at least in my judgment. Fairness and justice should not be blotted out by enthusiasm or bias. They are not violating the law, but some sure used it as a cloak for stirring up strife. Let me tell you what happened. They do not always violate the law. They go along with its words, but they insert themselves in situations where neither labor nor management wants them or asks their interference. I refer to two specific cases. The files are in my office and are subject to anybody's investigation. These are the two cases, and both occurred in Benton Harbor, Berrien County, Mich.

An employee left one job and went on another. One of the investigators came along and quizzed this employee. The same situation applied to both cases as a matter of fact. One was a woman and one was a man. And, investigators learned that the employee on the first job, where he had a supervisory job, and who had no complaint, mind you—the investigator went over the payroll and questioned the employee as to the duties and the work he had performed. The investigator said, "You are entitled to overtime." "Why?" "Because you worked beyond the number of hours prescribed by the law." Now, the service was voluntary; the employee was satisfied. He had not even by inference been asked to work overtime. I had the affidavit to that effect. But, the investigator from the Labor Department said: "Well, we must uphold the law, and whether you want it, whether you are satisfied, is beyond your prerogative to decide." So, Mr. investigator insisted that a claim be filed for the overtime. It was filed and payment for voluntary overtime work was made.

Well, was enforcement of the law all right, and if the employer and the employee—and I am not talking about mass-production industry where hundreds and thousands of people are working and where they need protection all the time; I am talking about those little concerns out in the sticks, family affairs in some cases, with a few employees, where the boss and the workers are get-

ting along all right and both are satisfied, both are working for a profit and a continuing job—keeping the business going. Is there any good reason why the investigator should butt in, unless, of course, his main purpose is to make work for himself—keep himself busy?

All too often along comes one of these busy investigators and inserts himself into the situation where everyone is satisfied and creates discord. According to what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] said, I believe this amendment should be agreed to. The representatives of the Department should stick to the job of investigating in situations where some worker is dissatisfied where there is a real violation and stay out of other situations where the employer and employee are getting along, where there never was the slightest intent to violate the letter or spirit of the law. They should not go in and try to create discord and disrupt an operation just so the Federal agent could make a showing—a little commonsense never harms. If the Department knows it is being scrutinized it will be more careful.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in this House long enough to recognize the temper of the House and what we may expect will be done with these cuts.

My Subcommittee on Military Operations has been studying methods of procurement under Government contracts. At this time we have a group of corporations owned or controlled by practically the same individuals who are making contracts with the Government to manufacture clothing articles for the armed services. Over the past few years they have had something like \$50 million worth of contracts. They have been cited for unfair labor practices, not once, but dozens of times. They have been cited by the inspectors who work in this particular division. In most instances they have had to pay the workers the wages which were due them under our national laws, and in some instances they have had to pay fines which, of course, went into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, you might say, why are we interested in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended. It becomes a matter of fairness, I think, to all bidders. If a bidder on a Government contract to manufacture clothing is a legitimate bidder, he expects to pay at least a dollar an hour to his employees and he bids a certain price. If someone else only has to pay 60 cents or 70 cents an hour, he can take the contract away from the legitimate bidder who is trying to comply with the laws of the United States, equitably and honestly and uprightly and honorably fulfilling the terms of his contract.

It narrows itself down to this: Do you want to give to the unfair bidder, one who will deliberately undercut wages in violation of the national standards, the advantage? Members who are in areas where the wage standards are upheld are letting themselves in for this, when they vote for this amendment. They will be voting to allow Government contracts to go from their area, where their legiti-

mate manufacturers are operating, whether it be in the field of textiles or any other item which they are manufacturing for the Government, and in effect voting for the scab contractor who is going deliberately to defraud his laborers, of the pay to which they are entitled under the Fair Labor Standards Act. It comes down exactly to that. We are investigating only about one-tenth of the cases that should be investigated. This means nine-tenths of them should be at least checked to see that they are complying with the law. But due to the lack of personnel we can check only 1 out of 10. In those 1 out of 10 we are finding many, many violators of this act. When they are found they have to pay the worker back the wages of which they have defrauded him, and in some instances pay fines for not obeying the law.

So in cutting this item you are taking away the raises these people in around the \$4,100-a-year capacity are supposed to get. You are weakening further the morale of these people who are trying to enforce fair labor standards throughout the United States, and you are voting in favor of the scab bidder in the low-cost, low-wage areas of our country. You are voting to perpetuate a low standard of living and therefore a low purchasing power among those people who receive below-standard wages. That is the proposition. That is why I rise to speak for the first time today, on this bill, in the hope that this amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is another example of voting for legislation and then turning around and trying to prevent the enforcement of the legislation we have voted for. That is the whole thing in a nutshell. We voted to increase not long ago the minimum wages of this country from 40 to 75 cents an hour, and we had a real fight on that. Then 2 years ago we voted to raise the minimum wages from 75 cents to a dollar an hour. I do not know who can quibble about paying a dollar an hour in minimum wages at this time.

If you want this law enforced, these people have to have the personnel. Is there any evidence that this agency is running wild or is operated loosely, or is there any evidence that the administrator of this program is not competent? Do you know who he is? He is a former secretary to the former Governor of New Hampshire, a man named Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams now is working in the White House, and as I understand it, he was his protege. If you know Mr. Adams as I know him, he had good help surrounding him all the time he was Governor, and I am sure he would not have suggested the administrator of this program unless he was an outstanding administrator. I have met the gentleman. I know he has been all over the country visiting all the field offices. I think he is doing a good job with the help he has now.

The amendment offered by my friend from Louisiana cutting off this two-hundred-some-odd-thousand dollars is breaking a commitment we have made

to these employees who were hired on the basis that they would serve an apprenticeship of 1 year and then be jumped in grade provided the Administrator was satisfied with the 1-year apprenticeship as investigators for the Wage and Hour Division. That is the whole sum and substance of this amendment you are voting for now.

Do you want to break faith with those men that have been hired as investigators on the basis that they would be hired at grade 7 and, if they completed an apprenticeship of 1 year successfully and were deemed by the Administrator to be good men, were promised to be raised to grade 9? That is exactly what you are doing; or else by this amendment you are going to ask them to decrease the number of personnel they have in their office by 60 at this time.

Even though there are 800,000 establishments covered under the law, they are going to be able to investigate only in the neighborhood of 50,000 of the 800,000. The majority of those 50,000 are going to be investigated not in any wild-goose chase or anything like that but on complaint of the workers involved or where experience has shown a number of violations in particular industries. There is not a legitimate business concern in this country, not one good legitimate business concern, that would want you to cut this expenditure for the enforcement of the wage and hour law. It is only the cheats and those who are paying under the minimum wages that do not want this law enforced. Let us make no mistake about that. Ninety-nine percent of the employers want it enforced. They want more investigators hired. They want more investigations made, because reputable employers are paying at least the minimum wages and they want their competitor who is paying sweatshop wages, under some conditions, at least be forced to meet the same standards.

I have it in my own State in the jewelry industry. The same situation of sub-minimum wages is rampant in New York City also, where we have men, women, and children today working in homes on jewelry for 10, 15, and 25 cents an hour. That is going on in New York City, in Rhode Island and in Massachusetts in the jewelry industry. That is what we are trying to stamp out, but we cannot stamp out that kind of competition, if you are going to come here today and ask that this appropriation be decreased and not allowed. You are hogtying this young man who is trying to do such a good job in the administration of this program in the Wage and Hour Administration, and then you are finding fault with him because he has not made sufficient investigations. On top of that, do you know how much was found to be due in back wages in the past year? I think about \$10 million was collected by the Government for those individuals who were not paid the minimum wages. But, in 1958, they anticipate on the basis of the record of 1957, that they are going to find due employees about \$18 million in back wages that are due to people who are working for less than the minimum wage or not being paid overtime today.

Do you want to deny these people who are not getting the minimum wage that protection that they now have? That is what you are going to do if you vote to adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. The reason I have asked for the gentleman's time to be extended is because I am very intrigued at the gentleman's statement that these men were promised a raise. I am reading from page 314 of the hearings where there appears a colloquy between the gentleman from Rhode Island and representatives of the department. Nowhere in this record do I read any suggestion that a raise is promised. As a matter of fact, if I may quote, this is the record:

Mr. FOGARTY. Then \$232,000 is for regulated investigator promotions. Is that for raising some of these investigators up to a supervisory capacity?

Mr. FRASER. No.

Mr. FOGARTY. What is this \$232,000 for?

Mr. BROWN. That is primarily the new investigators normally hired at GS-7—a few at 5, but mostly 7. They move up to grade 9.

Mr. FOGARTY. Are those automatic increases?

Mr. BROWN. They are not automatic, but the journeyman grade is a grade 9 basically and a man with a year's training and 4 weeks of intensive classroom work is ready normally at the end of a year for the journeyman grade.

Then there is another instance of such testimony but no place is there an indication of any such promise.

Mr. FOGARTY. I can answer the gentleman. When he said, "No, they are not automatic"—they are not automatic increases for every person that he hires. After a year's apprenticeship, he then selects those who have successfully passed the year's apprenticeship. That is why the raises are not automatic. But, it is selective. They are hired on the basis that they will be given an increase in-grade, if they successfully pass a 1 year's apprenticeship. So it is not automatic but selective because he selects those whom he thinks are doing the best job after a 1 year's apprenticeship and those who he believes will make the best investigators.

Mr. HÉBERT. But there is still no promise.

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, yes, there is. When the man is hired that is the understanding. That word "automatic" has no significance.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understood correctly, you said these people were promised a raise. Who promised them?

Mr. FOGARTY. It has been the practice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, no. Who promised them?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Administrator. Mr. HOFFMAN. Who? Name the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Brown.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What authority has he to tell them that they will get an increase?

Mr. FOGARTY. He is the Administrator of the wage and hour law. It has been departmental practice and we have found that is the best way to efficiently run this operation. As I understand it, the terms of employment offered to a new inspector is that he will serve a 1-year period of apprenticeship. If he finishes that efficiently and capably he can expect to be promoted to the grade of a journeyman inspector at the higher rating. Some of the Members of Congress have been complaining about the type of investigators we have had doing this work. This is a method by which the Department is able to secure well-qualified men who will be able to eliminate some of the complaints to which you refer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. I am one of them.

Mr. FOGARTY. This is the way to correct it. You can correct that situation by voting down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I know how the gentleman from Rhode Island legislates, and believe me, I am one of his greatest admirers as far as his work in the House of Representatives is concerned. But it strikes me as coincidental that when we raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1, immediately we have to have 321 more employees. I would like to ask the gentleman if he recalls how that particular figure was justified before his committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. Because of the number of violations that have been found on investigations. When the minimum wage was raised from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour, the ratio of violations to complaints was 1 to 8. When they raised the minimum wage from 75 cents an hour to \$1 an hour, it jumped from 1 to 8 to 1 to 5. So the violations have increased by that amount. In addition to that, the worst violators of all are the 50,000 new businesses a year that are established and the 50,000 businesses which go out of existence each year, and that is where most of the violations occur. Those are the places where we do not have a chance to investigate at all. In addition, the legislation required an annual review of all wage order established in Puerto Rico. It required added staff to perform this work.

So they are getting away with murder, and we cannot do anything about it, because we do not have sufficient personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 93, noes 69.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1958."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it would appear, I might say, that this House has become economy minded, evidently hearing from the folks back home. I wish the same atmosphere had prevailed during the last 10 years; but the fact remains that at the present moment we are in a very cutting frame of mind, everything cut, every particular item that comes up an amendment to cut is offered; trying to make an impression on the people that we have at long last become economy minded.

The country has grown to 170 million people, an amazing increase, a tremendous population. To make an extremely simple comparison it is like asking a man with a wife and 5 children to live today on the income he received 10 years ago when he had but 1 child and prices were much lower. We are growing. Some of these cuts offered may be justified, but certainly some are not. Not only has the cost of goods and services gone up in the past 10 years, but also in the instance of the man with the family, the family has grown. So the population of our country has grown. Admitted that we want economy in the conduct and operation of Government, let us not go hog wild on everything.

I am for economy as much as anybody in this House, and you know it.

I want to call to the attention of the House the help we have given Great Britain over the past years. In 1917 we gave the British as a World War I loan \$8 billion. In 1941, RFC loan, \$390 million; 1941 to 1945, lend lease, \$22 billion; 1946, postwar loan, \$3,750,000,000. And there are a lot of economy-minded people here today who voted for that British loan and the debt is not being paid, nor is the interest. But when it comes to our own backyard, we want to cut them down.

In 1948 to 1950, Marshall plan grants amounted to \$2,400,000,000. In 1948 to

1950, Marshall plan loans amounted to \$337 million. In 1951 to 1956, defense-aid grants of \$851 million, and defense-aid loans, \$48 million. Or total aid from the United States of \$37,776,000,000. The figures are from the U. S. News & World Report of March 22, 1957.

Now, get what the British are doing in reference to their health and welfare program. I might ask the chairman of the subcommittee, for the sake of argument, what is the total overall of this bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Less than \$3 billion.

Mr. GAVIN. For health, education, and welfare, what is the total?

Mr. FOGARTY. Two billion dollars.

Mr. GAVIN. All right. Now, here is what the British are doing; here is their budget. The British are spending for welfare: \$1,534,000,000 for national health services, \$1,876,000,000 for national insurance benefits, or a total of \$3,410,000,000. The British are also spending \$1,120,000,000 for educational expenditures. This is a total of \$4,530,000,000 for a population of 51 million people, while our overall program is less than \$3 billion for 170 million people. Now the irony of it is, as far as I am concerned, that while we are spending money on foreign aid to help the British, we have been doing it for years to carry out their various health, education, and welfare programs—without too much protest—as usually the foreign-aid appropriation bill goes through the House in a couple of hours, we sit here for days trying to see how we can cut back on similar programs for our people who have been paying the taxes to carry on all these foreign-aid programs.

If you want to do some sizable cutting, you will get a chance on the foreign-aid bill.

The British population has only grown by 6 percent. The population of the United States is growing 4 times faster than the British. Our population is up 22 percent in the last 11 years. It is true some of these organizations in this appropriation bill being considered today, have expanded their operational facilities. If you are going to practice discipline, why do you not practice discipline upon the pressure groups from back home that demand these things? All of the programs have been authorized. Now they ask for the appropriations and you are cutting them back. It should have stopped with the authorizations, but no, you wanted them authorized. You wanted these expanded facilities. The folks back home, the various groups, pressure you into that, but when it comes to appropriating the funds, all of a sudden cuts are demanded, you become economy minded. I am economy minded, too. Now you are out to slash promiscuously whether cuts are justified or not. Where the cuts are justified, certainly I want to support them, but remember this, you voted to authorize everything that is in this bill.

Here is another angle I want to bring into the picture. This is an article by a man named Don Robinson which appeared in the American Press. He said:

Ever since President Eisenhower announced that \$71.8 billion budget, I have been trying

to find a happy note in it. I finally found one.

The \$71.8 billion budget is only 16 percent of anticipated total national production for next year, whereas the 1953 budget, the President's first one, was \$20.7 percent of total national production in that year.

Furthermore, whereas the new budget is only 10 percent higher than the 1953 budget, total national income has increased almost 16 percent since 1953, hourly earnings of factory workers have risen 18 percent, and the population to be served by the Federal Government has increased by 10 million.

Although I am as opposed as anyone to the huge cost of Federal Government, I am pleased to find a slight silver lining by thinking in terms of percentage of income instead of just dollars.

Twenty-five years ago we could buy an automobile for one-third of the cost today. But during that period our total earnings have more than tripled, so that a new car costs, today, a smaller percentage of Mr. Average Man's earnings than it did in 1932.

Mounting Government costs seem a little less frightening when compared with the rapid rise in income plus the huge rise in the number of people our Government must serve. Even the national debt and our personal taxes are lower—as a percentage of our earnings—than they were 4 years ago.

Let's work to cut the budget and to cut the debt. But while doing so we may become a little less panicky when we realize that, although the trend, dollarwise, is upward, the trend percentagewise is downward.

Now, the way we are going here on this particular appropriation bill indicates to me that we are just not trying to think anything out. We are not taking a position on whether the cut is justified or is not justified. You are just determined to cut. Now you are going to get a chance to cut. As I pointed out, you paid over to Britain, one nation alone, \$37,776,000,000. I think there are some places where this budget can be cut. But, what I am getting at, with the great growth of our people in this great Nation of ours, we hear talk about peace, progress, and prosperity, and now we want to cut back—cut back, and cut down. If you did it wisely and carefully, I would have no objection. Incidentally, may I say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], it would appear from the evidence on the floor here today that your committee has not considered carefully these items in this appropriation bill. My question is, Have you? I do not know. I presume you spent hours and days and weeks, but with the amendments offered for promiscuous cutting I just wondered. What has your committee done?

Mr. FOGARTY. As I figure it up mentally, we spent 3 days now on the Department of Labor. It is the longest time we have spent on the Department of Labor in the 11 years I know something about. The House has cut about \$15.5 million, but of that \$15.5 million, \$14-million-odd are no cuts at all, because they do not come out of the Treasury. When you take off \$12 million for unemployment, for grants to States, that is nothing out of the Treasury at all, so after 3 days, you might say, if you stretched it a bit, you have shaved off about a million three or four hundred thousand dollars out of the entire bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not think, even though it does come down to what the gentleman from Rhode Island says, that maybe that is all we did, cut it \$1 million, that that certainly is not to be sneezed at? That is real progress; is it not?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes. I say that if the cuts are justified, that is one thing. But there seems to be a different attitude here today. Nobody seems to be listening. People come in on the floor and vote yes or no without even knowing what they are voting on.

I know the gentleman from Wisconsin is a conscientious, hard-working, practical, realistic, clear-thinking American. When the gentleman presents a case before the House I always listen intently to what he has to say. I have a great respect for him. But the attitude that has been shown here today is entirely different.

We are a big Nation of 170 million people. I do not like to see the trend that this debate has taken on these appropriations. I shall have more to say on the subject, if I have the opportunity, on other amendments to the bills in which I am interested.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. But I should like to know, what are the items that the gentleman feels we have cut in the last two days that we should not have cut?

Mr. GAVIN. I wish I had the time to reply to the gentleman, but it seems that nobody is paying any particular attention to any particular item. They are just trying to cut all of them. That is what I am objecting to. Some of the cuts are justified and some are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to make a tabulation of what has happened in the last 3 days as it affected the Department of Labor. That will appear in the RECORD. It will be my intention, as far as the bill for the Department of Labor is concerned, to ask for separate votes on amendments carrying cuts in the Solicitor's Office, the Veterans' Reemployment Rights Division, salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security, Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Women's Bureau, and the Wage and Hour Division.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say to the gentleman that it is my intention to ask for a rollcall on all the others which the gentleman has not mentioned.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am glad to hear that. I hope the gentleman will get some of his people to stand up for them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has done such a wonderful job; will he tell us which amendments have been adopted and what they do so that when we get to the rollcalls we will know what we are doing?

Mr. FOGARTY. When we have finished reading the bill, I will list the amendments that were adopted and how much they cut from the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And what they would do.

Mr. FOGARTY. So that everybody will know what they are voting on.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of stating publicly on this floor that the speech the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] made put this appropriation bill and the amendments thereto in a proper perspective. He pointed out that this is a growing, dynamic nation. We have 10 million more people in this country than we had in 1953. Necessarily, those people are going to require additional services.

Here is one Member of the House who has not come to the floor and condemned the Eisenhower budget. And I do not intend to condemn it because I do not as yet know enough about it to condemn it. But I will say this. Here is a case where we are faced with a rapidly increasing population, with laws providing mandatory increases in salaries to certain Federal employees. Most of the cuts that were made were made in funds which, as the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has pointed out, do not represent cuts in the budget at all but are rather denials of funds which were contributed by both employers and employees. As an employer of labor myself I participate in that and personally I do

not think that these funds which were placed in the hands of the Government in a trust capacity should be denied to the people who contributed them.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us what his intentions are with respect to the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is the intention to go today until 5 o'clock and then continue on tomorrow. I do not know whether or not we can finish the bill but we are going to go as far as we can.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the total cut for 3 days of work here amounted to about \$1,300,000?

Mr. FOGARTY. The real cut is \$1,345,000.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. At that rate, in 30 days we could cut it \$10 million, or if we stayed here a year or 300 days we could cut it \$100 million, which would be about one-seventh of 1 percent of the total amount of the budget.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman intend to finish the bill tomorrow?

Mr. FOGARTY. We are about one-third of the way through the bill, in 3 days. If we can finish the other two-thirds tomorrow, we will finish it. I may say it is going to take a good day of rollcalls, or maybe two, I do not know. At the rate it is going, we may have 2 days of rollcalls.

Mr. MORANO. Does that mean all these rollcalls will come tomorrow night?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know. That will depend on the Members, how late they want to stay.

Now I would like to summarize what has been done to the Department of Labor. The following table shows the statistics:

United States Department of Labor

	Committee recommendation	Floor action	Reduction
Office of the Secretary.....	\$1,510,000	\$1,480,000	\$30,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	2,225,000	2,021,000	204,000
Bureau of Labor Standards.....	1,031,300	985,000	46,300
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.....	542,000	406,000	136,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.....	3,600,000	3,600,000	
Bureau of Employment Security.....	6,000,000	5,558,000	442,000
Grants to States.....	262,000,000	249,814,000	12,186,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	36,800,000	36,800,000	
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.....	26,500,000	25,000,000	1,500,000
Mexican farm labor program.....	2,500,000	2,236,200	263,800
Bureau of Employees' Compensation.....	2,838,000	2,838,000	
Bureau of Labor Statistics.....	7,470,000	7,124,000	346,000
Women's Bureau.....	462,000	431,000	31,000
Wage and Hour Division.....	10,888,000	10,600,000	288,000
Total.....	364,366,300	348,893,200	15,473,100
Less:			
Reed bill items.....	268,000,000	255,372,000	12,628,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	36,800,000	36,800,000	
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.....	26,500,000	25,000,000	1,500,000
Total deductions.....	331,300,000	317,172,000	14,128,000
Total salaries and expenses.....	33,066,300	31,721,200	1,345,100

As a final statement to you, I want to reiterate emphatically what I have said a number of times during the presentation of the Labor Department items in the bill and summarize the results of the last 3 days' action. First point I want to reiterate is that you pass laws and then you fail to carry out your responsibility of seeing that necessary appropriations are made to administer them. I personally do not subscribe to such action.

The amendments offered during the past 3 days have been without constructive evaluation of what damage they will do. All of a sudden you make 1957 fiscal year something magic. It becomes the maximum program level for all legislation regardless of content. You want all appropriations cut to the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1957. But in your hysteria you do not stop there. You proceed in instances to reduce appropriations below the 1957 base. You fail to recognize legislation which you passed only last year which places a responsibility on each of these departments to pay their fair share into the retirement accounts for their employees. In some instances you have allowed it or part of it. You have also failed to recognize fiscal year 1958 has 1 more day than fiscal year 1957. These two items are sizable and will make further cuts in program necessary if funds are not appropriated for these purposes. One more overall statement before telling you in some detail just what you have done. My friends on the other side of the aisle have been notably conspicuous by the anemic support they have given their leader, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Labor.

Now just what has happened here during the past 3 days?

The press has been carrying stories of tens of millions of dollars of savings which have been made. Now, ladies and gentlemen, let us set the record straight. Let us not fool the public and let us not fool ourselves. The greatest part of the so-called savings will not save the United States Treasury a single cent.

Total reduction made on this floor during the last 3 days came to \$15,473,100. Of this, however, only \$1,345,100 can be considered actual savings.

I want to make this just as clear as can be—the only real savings which constitute a definite and permanent gain to the United States Treasury came to just a little over \$1.3 million. I am cognizant of the \$1.5 million reduction in the veterans unemployment compensation request but that is for payments that must be made to veterans in accordance with law and regardless of the amount needed we will have to provide it. Now to sum up the toil and stress of the last 3 days we come up with a \$1.3 million reduction—small indeed to the total Budget—but gigantic to the Department of Labor, a department of Government having the smallest staff of the Cabinet Departments. Every item which the Committee allowed had the most careful evaluation and I believe it a serious mistake to pick on the smallest Cabinet agency to attack for reductions. You ladies and gentlemen are jeopardiz-

ing such activities as the Consumer Price Index; the establishment of prevailing wages for Government construction contracts; the placing of older workers in jobs; helping physically handicapped to obtain employment; depriving workers of the wages they are entitled to by handicapping the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act; the reduction of industrial accidents, the increase here directed to work in the atomic-energy field; the problems of ever-increasing numbers of women workers, many of whom must work from economic necessity and many who industry find have talent that are best suited for the job to be done; and you have also eliminated funds to study the effect of imports and exports on American labor together with funds for much needed labor market information for areas of labor surplus.

Now a few detailed remarks about your actions of the past 3 days.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Your action eliminated the increase for the Office of International Labor Affairs amounting to \$30,000—a small sum to insure adequacy of the knowledge of the Department in the movement of workers and worker organizations in various parts of the world. It has been said many times that labor organizations are the first target point for Communists to try and make inroads. It is important that the Secretary in recommending labor policy both here and abroad have close to him staff advisory assistance. Again I say \$30,000 is a small amount of money for this purpose.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Here is where you become very ambitious. You not only cut this office back to 1957 but you did not allow money for the mandatory increases for retirement and transfer of funds previously approved in another appropriation. In the committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$2,225,000 there was only \$20,000 for program increases. The balance was for mandatory items. If your action stands, this means a reduction of some 35 positions—this reduction coming at a time when the workload of the Solicitor's Office shows increasing activity. The Solicitor's Office is beginning to feel in greater numbers the impact of litigation as a result of the recent amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The legislative requirement that the wage orders in Puerto Rico be reviewed annually has added a new burden to this Office. I cannot take the time here to go into all the details but I assure you that evidence was supplied in committee which was definitely convincing that the staff requested was needed. If the Solicitor's Office cannot carry out his litigation responsibilities there will be complaints not only from labor but there will be complaints from employers that unfair employers are taking advantage of them. Likewise workers will not receive the wages to which they are entitled by law. The Government will be the loser because third party suits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act will have to be passed by because of insufficient staff. Thou-

sands and thousands of dollars have been recovered by the Government through this legal technique.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

We had quite a debate on this item yesterday and I will not burden you with much detail. What you have done is quite simple. The program will be 15 percent larger in 1958 than in 1957. For this increased workload, the committee proposed a mere 4 percent increase in appropriations. You wiped out this small increase—the result of which means a deterioration of the program. More specifically you endanger an international agreement between this country and Mexico by making it impossible to carry out certain guaranties the Mexican Government requires for its nationals coming to this country to work in agriculture. Does not the figure of over 400,000 importations during the current fiscal year indicate the need for this program. As long as we enjoy a high level of employment we will need this program? As long as we enjoy a few thousands of savings is just a mistake.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

In the Bureau of Labor Standards the committee reduced the request here by \$135,700. It allowed \$119,800 increase over 1957, of which \$52,200 was for program increases. Program increases related to aiding in the employment of the physically handicapped, extension of safety service in the use of atomic energy, and improving conditions of domestic migrant workers. The balance of \$67,600 was for mandatory items. The action on the floor eliminated the program increases for enabling the Bureau to keep abreast of accident hazards in the atomic energy field and institute such action in their safety program necessary to promote safety for the workers involved.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Perhaps the most shocking thing of all has happened here. By shaving off \$136,000 from the committee recommendation, you are making necessary an actual reduction in level of operations for this most crucial activity.

As I stated on Tuesday, curtailment of other benefits for servicemen entering on duty after January 31, 1955 makes the reemployment program the only major readjustment device available to veterans.

The workload of this bureau will be substantially increased because of the buildup in the Ready Reserves. The number of reservists and national guardsmen who must perform training duty in 1958 will be about 40 percent over 1956 and 25 percent over 1957. This increase is due to the fact that all military releases after August 1957 must accept duty in the Active Reserve.

Because of your action this week, this Bureau will not be able to render adequate service to the veterans.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Let us see what damage you have done in reducing the committee recommendation for the Bureau of Employment Security by \$442,000. The committee had allowed only \$39,560 for program in-

creases including a transfer of \$53,300 from the office of the secretary. Cutting it back to the 1957 level without making allowances for mandatory items will make necessary the reduction of 60 positions. Let us take a look at the history. We have increased programs through legislation, increased the funds for State employment agencies, but we have done nothing to allow the national office to keep up with its expanding responsibilities. Specifically, it is responsible for supervision directly or indirectly of the handling of \$1½ billion in unemployment insurance tax collection; \$1¼ billion in unemployment insurance benefits; and one-fourth billion dollars in administrative funds. It is the one operating arm of Government that actually aids in the placement of the older worker into a job. Likewise it occupies the same role in placing physically handicapped workers into jobs they can perform. I believe you have made a terrible mistake in the action you took on Wednesday in reducing the appropriation request.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Cutting the program increases out of the Bureau of Labor Statistics request will be disastrous. This Bureau in the field of research and statistics is considered the best in its field. Its work is used by all of us as well as by management and labor and the public. As an example, again I remind you of the danger of cutting funds needed to insure accuracy of the Consumer Price Index. Four million workers' wages go up or down as this index moves. It must be accurate. It has become the biggest tool for settling management and labor differences on wage questions. Imagine what will happen if the accuracy of the index is questioned.

Time will not permit detail presentation of all this Bureau's programs, but I assure the Members of this body that its work in the field of wages, employment, productivity, wholesale and retail prices, are all important to our economy and they are used extensively. I think you all know that. It should not be allowed to deteriorate, but if your action stands that will be the result.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

You have sliced \$888,000 from the Wage and Hour Division, with the result that there will have to be an actual reduction in level of operations. This at a time when the rate of back wages found due is at the highest level ever—about \$20 million a year.

Two years ago, this body, by an overwhelming vote, increased the minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1. Are we now saying that we do not want to enforce that minimum? Wage-hour investigations show that 1 out of every 5 firms are violating the dollar minimum.

The committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$10,888,000 would not add a single employee to the Division. By cutting this item, you have reduced the staff and consequently reduced the level of enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Public Contracts Act.

You will cause a reduction in the already too small sample inspection check

which at this time is only 7 percent of 800,000 covered establishments.

You will handicap the Division carrying out its legislative responsibility of reviewing each wage order in Puerto Rico annually. If this work lags you will hear plenty from employers in the mainland.

The following telegram was received from George Meany, president of AFL-CIO, supporting the request for Wage and Hour and the Solicitor's Office.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 27, 1957.

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Initial actions of House in slashing vital programs of Labor Department most disturbing. Enforcement of labor standards will be crippled by cut in Solicitor's Office. Trust this cut will be restored on rollcall and that cuts for Wage-Hour Division will be resisted. Present hysteria over budget must not blind Congress to needs of American people in labor and welfare field. On behalf of 15 million workers, I call upon the Congress to support recommendations of Appropriations Committee.

GEORGE MEANY, —
President, AFL-CIO.

CONCLUSION

Now, ladies and gentleman, you do have a chance to correct the mistakes which you have made. I expect to ask for a number of rollcalls. I trust that Members on both sides of the aisle will join in supporting this request for a record vote. I expect to ask for a rollcall on practically every appropriation request.

I am hopeful that during these rollcalls, you will give some consideration to the significance of each of the cuts made. If you do, I believe you will agree that these cuts were the kind the President had in mind when he talked about foolish and fatuous cutting. These are cuts which the Republican Secretary of Labor asks be restored and as a further reminder for my friends on the other side of the aisle of the President's budget policy.

I quote an editorial from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "President and Budget."

PRESIDENT AND BUDGET

It was high time for Mr. Eisenhower to stand up for his budget. The Chief Executive's unwise intimation earlier that it was Congress' job to cut the budget had started a prairie fire. Demands from constituents had put legislators in a mood to cut foreign aid, school construction funds and other vital items. The implication, though not necessarily the fact, was that Mr. Eisenhower was encouraging them.

Yesterday Mr. Eisenhower forthrightly asserted the executive responsibility for the budget. In a dissertation that sometimes was eloquent, he reminded Congress that no dollars today * * * are being spent more wisely for the future of American peace and prosperity than the dollars we put in foreign aid. We are not going to cut projects in the security field severely, he said, "or we are going to suffer." Without school aid the classroom deficit will grow more serious. Talk of a \$5 billion budget reduction and a tax cut is absurd in light of the essential national interest in veterans' care, agriculture, public education and the like; "it is just fatuous to get up and say we are just going to save all this money, and then not do something about Federal responsibilities

already given us." There are plenty of areas for legitimate economies by Congress in eliminating the postal deficit, in adjusting Federal service fees and below-cost loan rates and in pruning the perennial rivers and harbors projects that seem to flow on forever.

Whether this impressive defense comes too late to prevent damage remains to be seen; the fire may unhappily be out of control. In any event, it is heartening to have evidence that Mr. Eisenhower intends to fight for what he believes in. His words yesterday were befitting the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; payment in advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$9,300,000.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: Page 13, line 7, strike out "\$9,300,000" and insert "\$7,973,000."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with a sensitive agency because it deals with activities affecting all of the people of the United States. It is not a meat-ax cut. It does not go back of the figures of 1957. There is sufficient money left in the bill to carry on activities at the level they were carried on throughout 1957; to provide for the civil-service contribution and for the extra day's pay; to provide funds necessary to replace old and obsolete equipment; and funds to establish a new office which the agency wishes to establish to bring up the list of offices throughout the country to 17.

The amendment would eliminate money requested to increase personnel 16 percent above 1957 or to add 162 persons to the rolls.

I am aware of the fact that a Citizens' Advisory Committee recently advocated an expansion of the food-and-drug activity, but I think we should expand gradually. With my amendment adopted, the Food and Drug Administration will have over \$1 million more than it had in 1957, and that will be a sizable increase in just 1 year.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I was afraid the gentleman was not going to mention the agency. It is the Food and Drug Administration?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. What are the personnel the gentleman refers to in his amendment?

Mr. JONAS. I cite the gentleman to page 111 of the hearings, and I read the following:

Thus there remains \$1,327,000 of the increase requested for an expansion of current operations, which represents about a 19-percent increase over the appropriations for the current fiscal year. The latter amount will allow a 16-percent increase in personnel or 162 new positions in fiscal year 1958 (45 departmental, 117 field).

Mr. RIVERS. Inspectors?

Mr. JONAS. Forty-five departmental and 117 for the field.

I call the committee's attention to the fact that in addition to these appropriated funds the agency has some money which it receives as a result of fees collected in operations.

These are estimated at \$1,254,000 for 1958; and the amount of those fees would be added to the amount left in the bill if the amendment is adopted. This would provide \$9,227,000 for next year.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mrs. SULLIVAN requested and received permission to revise and extend her remarks and to include a statement.)

MINIMUM PROGRESS ON AN URGENT PROGRAM TO
REBUILD STRENGTH OF THE FOOD AND DRUG
ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to one of the finest Members of the Congress of the United States, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY of Rhode Island, and to the Members of his subcommittee, for their work on this appropriation bill now before us.

They have looked behind the dollar mark. They have seen a vision of a better America and a better world. They have translated the dull and dreary figures of their assigned part of a \$72 billion Federal budget into terms of better health, better living, the pursuit of happiness, for the 170 million people of this country.

There has been some criticisms here of the so-called extravagances involved in this appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are told that we are handing out nearly three billions of dollars, as if, perhaps, we were throwing money around loosely.

If a President—or a laborer in the steel mills—or a housewife—or a child can avoid a heart attack as a result of research provided for in this bill; or if a way is found to ease the agony of cancer, let alone cure or prevent cancer; or if people otherwise doomed to the crippling misery of arthritis can be guided to a pain-free life—if any of these things can be done through the money we appropriate to the National Institutes of Health, who is there among us who will

say it is money wasted—thrown away—frittered away?

Going through the many items in this appropriation bill, it is obvious that these are generally the most constructive appropriations we make all year. We use this money to learn not how to kill, but how to help our people to live in health, to live better, happier, more productive lives.

This appropriation bill did not take shape in a vacuum. It was not put together in a catch-as-catch-can, haphazard manner. It did not suddenly materialize out of thin air. It was put together item by item by the subcommittee under Mr. FOGARTY with devotion and care and full awareness of the meaning and need represented in every single item.

I say that not only each of us in the House of Representatives but every American—and everyone who loves humanity—owes Chairman FOGARTY and his subcommittee, and the members of the full Committee on Appropriations, our thanks for a wonderful job of conscientious legislating in the public interest on this bill.

THE FOOD AND DRUG APPROPRIATION

I happen to be most familiar out of all of the many items in this bill with the one dealing with the Food and Drug Administration. Ever since coming to Congress in 1953, I have made the work of the Food and Drug Administration one of my prime interests as a Member of the House, as one who attempts to look at legislation primarily from the consumer standpoint.

In several previous years, I was heart-sick over the treatment given to the Food and Drug Administration by the President and his former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mrs. Hobby was never really convinced, it seems, that this Agency was important or did a worthwhile job.

In 1954, in addition to resisting efforts made by some of us to increase appropriations for this Agency, Mrs. Hobby asked instead that we provide funds for an objective study of the Food and Drug Administration to see if the Agency was being unfair to business or overly zealous for the consumer, or was really performing an important function. The funds for such a study were provided, and the report which eventually came to us as a result—made by a group appointed by Mrs. Hobby—proved beyond doubt that the Food and Drug Administration was horribly understaffed, underequipped, and unable to do the things it should do for the consumer and the American public, as well as for legitimate business operating against unscrupulous competition from fly-by-night outfits.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE URGED HUGE EXPANSION

The Advisory Committee urged an immediate start on a complete overhaul of the Agency's facilities and a threefold to fourfold increase in funds. It suggested that this tremendous expansion should occur within 5 to 10 years.

Many of the Members are familiar with the attempt which I made in 1955, right after this Advisory Committee re-

port was made public, to begin immediately to provide added funds for the proposed rebuilding program. But it was not until last year, when the current fiscal year budget was under consideration, that the President first included in his budget and first supported any funds for an expansion of the Food and Drug Administration. So we were a full year late in getting started.

A modest expansion is now underway. The budget for the coming fiscal year would continue that expansion program, at a somewhat stepped-up pace. Last year, we added roughly \$1 million to the \$5½ million appropriation for Food and Drug; in this bill now before us we would add \$2½ million more, making a total of \$9,300,000 for the regular activities of the Food and Drug Administration.

Looking at the comparative figures, on a percentage basis, this might appear to some to be a vast increase—another instance, perhaps, of extravagance. But let me call several things to the attention of the Members:

First, this is an item of \$9,300,000 out of a nearly \$3 billion appropriation bill—a mere pittance in a \$71.8 billion budget—less than 6 cents per person for 170 million Americans to protect them from filthy or dangerous or adulterated or fraudulent foods, drugs, or cosmetics.

Second, let me remind the Members what the Appropriations Committee report written by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FOGARTY, says about this item:

The citizens committee (that is, the advisory committee I referred to earlier) recommended that personnel and facilities (for the Food and Drug Administration) be increased threefold to fourfold within 5 to 10 years. At the rate provided for in the bill it will take a minimum of 10 years to somewhat less than treble the personnel and facilities.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, this is the very least, the very least, the minimum, that the Advisory Committee recommended be done to protect the American people through the Food and Drug Administration.

PROCEEDING AT MINIMUM PACE IN REBUILDING
FDA

This is the very minimum. If this item were to be reduced, it would slow up this urgent rebuilding program below a level considered safe by a citizens' advisory committee appointed by a critical, doubting, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the operations of an agency in her Department she seemed to fear might be spending too much money. You can be sure Mrs. Hobby did not appoint to the Advisory Committee persons whom she felt would be spenders and wasters of Federal funds for unnecessary functions.

By rights, we should be rebuilding the Food and Drug Administration at the higher level recommended by the Advisory Committee—so that within 5 years it would be 4 times as effective as it was at the time the study was made. Instead, we provide in this bill an amount which permits expansion to 3 times previous size by 1966.

I am certainly not going to criticize the Appropriations Committee for not

going faster on this. I think the Fogarty subcommittee did the very best anyone could reasonably expect in this regard; as it did on so many other items in this bill.

I only hope that none of the Members of the House become so carried away by the delightful prospect of cutting President Eisenhower's budget anywhere and everywhere, without regard for particular items or particular needs, as to join in seeking to reduce this long-overdue increase in the funds of the one agency set up to protect us from impure drugs, foods, and cosmetics, all 170 million of us. I urge the Members to use sound judgment and not vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my remarks, I include the testimony which I submitted to Chairman FOGARTY's subcommittee at hearings last month on this bill, as follows:

ADEQUATE FUNDS FOR FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

(Testimony by Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, before House Appropriations Subcommittee for Department of Labor and for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 28, 1957)

There are many items in the budgets of both Departments involved in this appropriation bill that I would like to take up today, because these deal with functions of government directly affecting the average family and the individual citizen—more so, I would say, than any appropriation bill applying to the other departments. This subcommittee, in my experience in the Congress, has always recognized the vital importance of these functions of government, and I want you to know how much I admire and respect the chairman and the other members for the great good they have accomplished in behalf of the health and safety and well-being of the American people.

Knowing how much testimony you have had to listen to and how much detailed investigation you have had to make into these various appropriation requests, I do not intend to burden you with a long discussion of all the items in the Labor Department and in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department in which I am interested. I do hope that you will see your way clear to recommend the full budget amount for most of the items in the two Departments. I think they are vital to the health and welfare of the whole country.

I refer to such things as the activities of the Department of Labor in enforcing the wage and hour laws, in promoting industrial safety through the Bureau of Labor Standards, in the activities of the Employment Service and the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, and the Veterans' Placement Service, the unemployment compensation program, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which makes such important studies in living costs and housing, and so on, and the Women's Bureau and the work they are trying to do there to improve employment opportunities particularly for older women. They are just some of the things in the Labor Department budget I wanted to mention which are so important to so many people in urban districts like mine, and for that matter in the whole country.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

When we get over into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare there is a tremendous area of additional activity affecting and involving people—families. Here you have all the social security activity, not only the programs for retired work-

ers and the survivors of workers, but also the aid to dependent children, the aid to the blind, the aid to the disabled, the aid to the elderly—in other words, the public-assistance programs in which the States participate along with the Federal Government; there is the invaluable, priceless work of the Public Health Service, including the research work they are doing through the National Institutes of Health for research into the crippling and killing diseases; there is the vocational rehabilitation program, the hospital-construction program; there is all the work centered in the Office of Education, and I want to mention particularly in that connection the important work they are doing in behalf of mentally retarded children where so much research is still needed and where we are going to need operating funds, too.

As I said, I would like to go into these items in some detail, but for one thing I don't want to burden you with so much additional material, and for a second thing—and more important—I think this subcommittee is already thoroughly familiar with all of these needs and has done an outstanding job in providing funds for them. I will always remember the way the House of Representatives, on the strength of assurances from Chairman FOGARTY, has frequently appropriated a great deal more than the budget for some of these items, and particularly for the research programs in cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and so on. I will be more than glad to back up this subcommittee any time on additional funds over and above the budget requests for these items, whenever the chairman and the other members of this subcommittee tell us the additional funds can be used efficiently and effectively.

THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

That brings me, now, to the needs of the Food and Drug Administration. As all of you know, this agency of Government has been particularly close to my heart ever since I came to Congress. I have always supported and fought for more adequate appropriations for this agency. As you know, I was extremely critical of Mrs. Hobby when she was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for what I considered her stepchild treatment of this agency—cutting its budget, or at least acquiescing to White House cuts in this budget, at a time when increases were in order rather than decreases.

I was critical several years ago when funds were requested for an advisory committee study of the Food and Drug Administration. I said there wasn't anything such a committee study would show about deficiencies in the Administration—the Food and Drug Administration—that could not be corrected merely by providing adequate funds for this agency.

Nevertheless, the study was authorized and the citizens who conducted it turned in a report which was not a bit startling or surprising to any of us who followed the work in pure food and drug and cosmetic enforcement. The citizens' committee suggested a threefold to fourfold increase in the work and facilities of the Food and Drug Administration in order to build it up to the point where it could adequately protect the public not only from fraud but from dangerous foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

As you know, the President and Mrs. Hobby made no effort to implement this recommendation in 1955, after the citizens' committee filed their report, and so a full year went by before Congress was even asked to start increasing appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration. So in this present fiscal year, we have seen the first real advance in food and drug activities, thanks to the substantial increase we put through in 1956—an increase of nearly \$1 million—which has allowed a 15-percent increase in staff and which has really started the wheels

moving in the improvement of enforcement activities.

BUDGET PROVIDES 16 PERCENT STAFF INCREASE

I am pleased by the data in the budget which shows that about 15 percent more plant inspections are being made this year than were made in 1956 fiscal year, but it is still an inadequate program of inspection. Out of nearly 100,000 establishments, the current budget allows inspections of only a little more than 14,000 a year.

The budget for next year, calling for an increase of \$2,521,000 in enforcement activities would raise the total for this purpose from \$6,779,000 to \$9,300,000. This will cover two very important needs—one a 16-percent increase in staff, and particularly in scientific staff and inspectors, and the other a substantial program of capital investment to replace, improve, and modernize equipment and facilities now obsolete. I understand that some of the equipment is so old, so obsolete, so quaint and unusual in this atomic era that the Smithsonian Institution has its eye on this equipment and wants it for some of its historic displays. I think it is rather significant that an agency of Government responsible for protecting our health from adulterated or contaminated or filthy or dangerous products we consume internally or use on our skin must get along with such outdated equipment.

The total carried in the budget for the Food and Drug Administration is \$10,554,500. However, part of that, \$1,254,500, is for certification and inspection work paid for by industry in connection with new drugs or new items, and only \$9,300,000 is for regular activities of the agency.

I am sponsoring legislation this year, along with Congressman DELANEY, of New York, to close some of the loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, dealing with the increasing use of chemicals and chemical additives which we do not know for a fact are safe for human consumption. If that bill goes through I will certainly be back here for more money to make sure the Food and Drug Administration can carry out the increased powers the proposed legislation would give them.

THE CHEMICAL-ADDITIVE PROBLEM

By rights, in the absence of this legislation to close the loopholes in the present law, the Food and Drug Administration should have that extra money now. Untold numbers of chemicals are now being used in foods, including coloring materials, preservatives, and so on, which we cannot be sure are completely safe. Some coal tar colors previously in use have been withdrawn as a result of the Food and Drug Administration's studies. Other chemicals are suspect. This is indeed serious. Some of our great cancer experts are very much concerned over the possible danger through mishandling or misuse, or even through authorized use, of some of these chemicals.

We have the assurance of the Food and Drug Administration that no chemicals are now being used in food which are known to cause cancer. Naturally, they would not stand for that.

But there is this no-man's land of chemicals, hormones, additives, colorings, and so on, which cries for much more study, much more analysis, tougher controls, more research.

The Food and Drug Administration has done a fine job with the limited resources it has had at its command. The budget this year as proposed will enable a substantial increase in their activities. But this is only a start—a long overdue recognition by the President of the vital importance of the work of this agency in protecting your health and mine and that of everyone we know—everyone who buys and uses any of the fantastic variety of new products in the food, drug, and cosmetic line.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in these days of concern about economy in Government it is important that we keep our sense of values. There are activities in our Government which need to be expanded, rather than reduced. Their importance to the American people is not measured by their small cost. Therefore it is most gratifying to see that the Appropriations Committee recommended the full amount of the budget increase proposed for the Food and Drug Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This shows they have carefully considered the problems dealt with by this small but important agency.

One could hardly find a better example for the point I wish to make. The Food and Drug Administration is the organization we depend on to carry out the purpose of Congress to insure that foods, drugs, medical devices, and cosmetics are pure and wholesome, safe to use, and properly labeled.

The importance of these thousands of products is obvious. What we may forget is that these foods which sustain our lives and these drugs we rely upon when we are sick are all subject to deterioration and spoilage, as well as to the possibilities of careless handling and fraudulent misrepresentation. Always there is the human element and therefore the risks of errors and dishonesty. Fortunately these weaknesses are not typical, but we must remember that American industry is very large, and even this small fringe group is a big group for an organization the size of the Food and Drug Administration.

I have here their latest monthly report. During the month of February, 271,000 pounds of contaminated food products were taken off the market. Another 239,000 pounds was destroyed by the owners under the supervision of the inspectors. Six drug products were seized because they were improperly labeled or otherwise dangerous to the user. One of them was digitalis, a drug used by heart patients, which did not have the proper strength. Another was a drug represented to be one of the new tranquilizers but which in fact was merely a sedative containing ingredients that have been available for many years. Another was one of these oldtime Indian herb tonics, some of which still occasionally show up on the market. In addition to these cases, there were seven criminal prosecutions for selling dangerous drugs such as sleeping pills without a doctor's prescription. A bakery was prosecuted because the plant was insanitary and the pies and cakes were contaminated with insect and rodent filth. And finally there is a report here that the Supreme Court upheld the conviction of a man who was selling a phony treatment device for the cure of cancer and other serious diseases. He is now in Federal prison.

As Federal agencies go, the Food and Drug Administration is quite small. It

has an enforcement staff of 1,000 employees, including around 300 inspectors and 200 chemists who test the samples of products that are brought in by the inspectors. Then there are the research scientists who are constantly confronted with new products and ingredients, for which they must find new methods of detection and measurement. For the fact is that the technological progress of our food and drug industries is constantly creating new problems of public protection.

New medicines like these tranquilizing drugs we have been hearing about and the hundreds of chemical materials that are being used in the growing and processing of foods must be carefully studied and regulated to make sure they are properly labeled and used in safe amounts.

At the same time the volume of all these foods, drugs, and cosmetics has been growing in proportion to the needs of our expanding population. The 300 FDA inspectors are responsible for checking over \$62 billion worth of products. They are supposed to check the operations of around 100,000 manufacturing and distributing establishments. Thus the job of the Food and Drug Administration has been growing in both size and complexity.

Notwithstanding these growing needs the Food and Drug Administration has today only a handful of employees more than it had in 1941. The inadequacy of the organization to deal with its vast responsibilities was recognized in a study made 2 years ago by a distinguished citizens advisory committee. This committee was composed of leading people from business, education, labor, and the legal profession. Included on it representatives of industries regulated under the food and drug laws. This committee reported that while there was approximately 1 enforcement person for each 160,000 population in 1941, there was only 1 for each 200,000 in 1955. They found that some of the laboratory facilities, including some equipment dating back to 1914, had not been replaced to keep up with modern technological developments. They found that the administration was operating on the equivalent of a prewar budget while the unit volume of goods which it must control has approximately doubled. At the same time they found that due to amendments of the law the responsibilities of enforcement were at least twice as great as those existing 10 years ago. They concluded it was unreasonable to expect any group to handle a quadruple task with tools originally designed for one.

The committee said that the scope and complexity of the present enforcement and regulatory problems, if dealt with inadequately, constitute a threat to the health and welfare of our citizens. They said the resources of the FDA are woefully inadequate to discharge its present responsibilities.

The committee recommended that there should be a threefold to fourfold expansion in the facilities and staff of the Food and Drug Administration, to be accomplished in a period of 5 to 10 years.

A beginning has been made in this greatly needed expansion program. Last year an increase of \$995,000 was voted, and the House Appropriations Committee report said this was the "first step in carrying out a program of strengthening food and drug inspection along the general lines that were recommended unanimously by a Citizens Advisory Committee established for the specific purpose of reviewing this activity which is so important to the health of the American people."

This increase, amounting to about 15 percent, actually enabled the FDA to increase the total enforcement staff to 939, just 1 more than they had in 1951, the previous high point. But it enabled them to get started with their expansion plans. This year a further increase has been recommended amounting to approximately 26 percent. I am glad to say that the Appropriations Committee has recommended that we provide the full amount of the suggested increase. It is the second step in the much needed expansion. The citizens committee said that personnel and facilities should be increased threefold to fourfold within 5 to 10 years. At the rate provided for in the bill it will take a minimum of 10 years to somewhat less than triple the personnel and facilities.

It is interesting to see how the Food and Drug Administration proposes to use the increased funds for 1958. The major emphasis in their proposed program is on research into the new problems of food and drug protection. For example, they want to work on new methods for detecting and measuring the residues of chemicals in food—the poison sprays and dusts which we must depend upon to protect our crops, but which may also be harmful if they are not controlled. They want also to develop methods for testing the chemicals that are added directly to food and to study effects of these materials on laboratory animals to find out if they are harmful.

Another project is bacterial studies on frozen foods and precooked foods which so many people are now using. What happens when some of these products are allowed to thaw out before they are sold, as may sometimes happen? Then they plan to investigate some of these new cosmetic ingredients to see if they really produce the beautifying effects that women are paying for. They also plan to do more work in developing and enforcing food standards which regulate the quality of foods and help to protect the consumer's pocketbook.

These are some but by no means all of the important scientific problems which are included in the expansion program for 1958 which the Appropriations Committee has approved. This program will make possible an increase of about 15 percent in personnel. It also provides for new scientific equipment and for a much needed district office and laboratory to serve the Detroit area.

There is nothing political about this program. It is vitally needed and long overdue. If the program is to be made effective it will require a series of substantial annual increases over a period

of years. This is only the second step. With the changes that are taking place in the food, drug, and cosmetic industries we cannot protect the public by standing still. Last year, speaking at the 50th anniversary of the pure food and drug law, Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made this interesting statement. He said it is a "strange paradox that a program so essential to the health and safety of the public was so difficult to establish and now has been permitted to fall behind the needs of the times." He pointed out that it took a 23-year crusade by Dr. Harvey W. Wiley to get the original law enacted. Since then it has been a problem to obtain adequate enforcement.

Mr. Folsom came to this conclusion:

Food and drug protection must now advance, and continue to advance, in order to meet the challenge of scientific developments and growth in our food, drug and cosmetic industries. The Food and Drug Administration must be given what it needs to catch up—and keep up—with its job.

To reach this goal will require the continued interest of all of us—the public, the regulated industries, and Congress.

RELEASE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 25, 1957

Forty-two Federal court seizures and 9 criminal actions in February for alleged violations of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act were reported today by the Food and Drug Administration.

Food seizures removed 271,600 pounds of contaminated products from the market. An additional 239,000 pounds of unfit foods were voluntarily destroyed by owners under the observation of FDA inspectors.

Six of the seizures involved drugs. One product, represented to be one of the recently developed "tranquillizing" drugs available without prescription, actually is a sedative containing ingredients that have been available for many years, FDA officials said. True "tranquillizer" drugs, recently developed, are restricted to prescription sales, as a protection to the public.

Another seizure involved a compound similar to the Indian bark mixtures of the past. Labeled only as a "general tonic," it was sold for whatever ills the purchasers thought it would benefit. The Government charged that it failed to bear adequate directions for use, and would not accomplish any useful purpose.

A second product seized because of inadequate directions for use was a "royal jelly" mixture falsely recommended by mail to be used for delaying old age, as a rejuvenator, for the elimination of chronic tiredness, and as a "fountain-of-youth" cocktail.

Other drug seizures involved a new drug marketed without FDA safety clearance, a laxative failing to bear adequate warnings against misuse, and substandard digitalis tablets.

The FDA noted final results of the appeal of a 1956 injunction contempt case involved "Orgone Energy Accumulator." The defendants, the Wilhelm Reich Foundation, Wilhelm Reich, M. D., and Michael Silvert, M. D., having lost their appeals, filed a motion to have the jail sentences and fine set aside. The trial court heard their argument, denied their request, and committed the individuals to prison on March 11, and recommended psychiatric treatment.

FEBRUARY 1957 CRIMINAL CASES CHARGING VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

UNFIT FOODS

Defendant, product, principal violation charged, and sentence

Case-Moody Pie Corp., and James Henderson, manager, Chicago, Ill.: Pie and cake was prepared in an insanitary plant and contained insect and rodent filth. Firm fined \$1,000, plus costs of \$39.60. Henderson fined \$100.

Frank L. Worley, trading as Frank L. Worley Flour Mill, Rainsboro, Ohio: Flour was prepared in an insanitary plant and contained filth and less than the amount of enriched ingredients required by the standard for enriched flour. Fined \$200.

Over-the-Counter Sales of Prescription Drugs

Wayne Reel, trading as Dixie Cabins, and Jack Stilwell, Vincennes, Ind.: Selling amphetamine without physicians' prescriptions. Reel fined \$250; Stilwell fined \$100; both sentenced to 6 months in jail; suspended, and placed on probation for 6 months.

John L. Schulte, trading as Schulte Drug Store, Sioux City, Iowa: Selling and refilling amphetamine prescriptions while on 30-month probation in illegal drug sales case terminated in February 1956. Probation continued and extended 30 months on condition that defendant discontinue the drug business.

Phillips Drug Co., Inc., Charles C. Spagnolo, president and store manager, and Joseph Greenblatt, pharmacist, Boston, Mass.: Refilling barbiturates, penicillin, and Butazolidin prescriptions without physicians' authorizations. Firm fined \$500; Spagnolo fined \$300; Greenblatt fined \$200.

Joseph Fried, trading as Fried's Pharmacy, and Benjamin Wolin, pharmacist, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Selling and refilling antibiotics, sulfonamides, hormones, and amphetamine prescriptions without physicians' authorizations. Fried fined \$400; Wolin fined \$100; both placed on probation for 1 year.

Weylin Chemists, Inc., Charles Rogers, president and pharmacist, Milton Weinstein, vice president, treasurer, and pharmacist, Irving Sherman, pharmacist, New York, N. Y.: Selling and refilling amphetamine, sulfonamides, and hormone prescriptions without physicians' authorizations. Firm fined \$100; individual defendants fined \$1 each with payment remitted.

Rothschild's Pharmacy, Gustave Rothschild, partner and pharmacist, Phillip Kaiser, pharmacist, Syracuse, N. Y.: Selling and refilling amphetamine, sulfonamides, and barbiturates, prescriptions without physicians' authorizations. Firm fined \$1,000; Rothschild fined \$600; Kaiser fined \$200.

Jack Aaron Bloom, trading as Dorchester House Pharmacy, Dallas, Tex.: Selling and refilling barbiturates prescriptions without physicians' authorizations. Fined \$500, plus \$500 to be probated for 1 year. (Terminated in January but not previously reported.)

Dr. Thomas Guy Brown, Dumas, Tex.: Dispensing of amphetamine not in the course of professional practice. Sentenced to jail for 5 months, fined \$500, and placed on probation for 4 years.

Injunction Contempt Appeal

Wilhelm Reich Foundation, Wilhelm Reich, M. D., Rangeley, Maine, and Michael Silvert, M. D., New York, N. Y.: Sentences of Reich to 2 years in jail and Silvert to 1 year, and fine of \$10,000 against the foundation, for criminal contempt of Orgone injunction were reported in June 23, 1956, release. Conviction upheld by United States Court of Appeals for First Circuit, December 11, 1956, and certiorari denied by Supreme Court

February 25, 1957. Original sentences reinstated by trial court March 11, 1957.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I just hope my friend understands that I am not trying to damage, emasculate, or adversely affect the Food and Drug Administration. My amendment provides for more than a \$1 million increase over funds available in 1957.

Mr. RIVERS. But you do not permit them to put on one single solitary inspector, and now they are short-handed. Listen, nobody gave me this. This is RIVERS talking. I have been looking at this thing for at least 6 weeks.

Mr. JONAS. I wanted the gentleman to be sure he understood the situation.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to say to my distinguished friend I would not impute anything to him, because if there is anybody for whom I have a loftier esteem than the gentleman, I have not met him, and if I have reflected on his integrity, I hereby and herewith withdraw it. So, I say, we might be making a big mistake, but I know you would not do it intentionally.

Mr. JONAS. My theory is that we cannot pick and choose. We have to make cuts all the way along the line if we expect to get anywhere in our efforts to reduce the budget.

Mr. RIVERS. There is no question about that. But, I say this organization is going on on the 1941 level now. They have no spokesman. They have not had anybody to carry the ball for them. They are protecting us. This organization has been overlooked over the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are only a few subjects that I know very much about, and therefore I do not get to talk often, but this happens to be a matter that I do know something about.

There is one item that I want to mention for fear I might forget. If for just this one reason, it justifies this organization. I have watched quacks and quack-produced medicines all my life. We have an organization now in Dallas, Tex., known as the Hoxie Clinic. That is the greatest bunch of humbuggers that the world has ever known. There is only one organization that has done anything about it, and that is the Pure Food and Drug Administration. If they spent every dime in this bill to get rid of that bunch of fakers, they would be doing a good job.

Let us not be foolish about this thing. Let us talk about these humbuggers just a bit. Somebody will say, "I went out there and I had cancer and they cured me." "Who said you had cancer?" "Dr. Hoxie did." I have a bunch of those little moles on me. If I went out there, they would say I had cancer and that

"you are just about ready to fall down and break apart." But, if a man goes to them with cancer, I will assure you they do not help him. The only one that can do any good is the scientist and the medicines produced by the medical profession and the surgeons all over this country who have given their lifetimes in study.

Now, I have voted for cuts here, and I talked for them, but this, of all places on earth, is not the place to cut it. Where would we be today, with hundreds of people seeking cures and being taken advantage of by these quacks. There have been thousands of vaccines produced that the Pure Food and Drug Administration have not approved. They could not be sold to our good people until the Salk vaccine came along. Let us put more money in here if we are going to do anything. Let us not cut it. They have to take care of everything from medicine to fruits, as you have been told by the gentleman from South Carolina. This is a busy bunch. This thing is growing. Unless you have been in the business a little bit yourself, as I have, you would have no idea how many different kinds of new patents there are on medicines and the quantity of work that those people have to do. There are literally hundreds of thousands of small concerns that want to manufacture a little vitamin. For example, there would be a concern that wants to manufacture a little of this or a little of that, and a lot of it is no good. A concern must submit its samples and state what it does, and what is in it, and if you put a label on there that has anything other than what the label reveals, I will guarantee you that they will confiscate every bottle and put a concern out of business and send another inspector out and see that it is corrected.

I am not going to take any more time. I may have talked too long and it probably will not do any good. However, I felt that inasmuch as I have been in the study and practice of dentistry, and in scientific research of this kind for a long time, and since I have had my eyes glued on my microscope for many, many hours trying to find some kind of bug that might have caused pyorrhea or other diseases that destroy the teeth and the health of the people, that I knew something of the subject and can speak with some degree of authority. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if we cut anything out of this program for the health and welfare of the people it will be the most foolish thing we have ever done. My plea is to let the program continue.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the times when we ought to be thinking about doing what was the right thing to do. The increase that is provided in this amendment of up to practically \$8 million is about half of the increase submitted by the budget.

The trouble with these people not being able to keep up with their work has been that over the years they have been trying to do so many things that they should not do and have wasted their

money right down to the current fiscal year on such things instead of doing what they are supposed to do.

Just this last year they blossomed into a project of spending about \$60,000 in an effort to convict a mountain spring water outfit down in Arkansas of some kind of a violation. There was nothing the matter with the water and nothing the matter with the labels. They sent people up into my district and canvassed the district to find people who used this mountain water. We are away off, 2,500 miles from where the stuff came. No misrepresentation was involved in the sale, or anything of that kind.

A little while ago they got after a young fellow who invented a new kind of way of cutting up beets and putting them in cans. There was nothing out of the way about it, but they pestered that fellow to death until they drove him out of business and into bankruptcy. Last year, instead of going down into places where complaints were prevalent and inspecting the eggs that were in the market illegally, they spent time on such a performance as that mountain water deal.

This is not the only matter I could talk about; I could talk for half an hour on some of the things that I have run into from day to day that they have done that they ought not to be doing. I am not going to tell you any more, but if they would just tend to their own business and do the things they ought to do and not try to reach out and mess everything up for a lot of people, they would have plenty of money.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Is it not true that none of the 162 new positions will be abolished if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is adopted? If I read correctly the hearings on page 114, \$1,327,000 will be required to have sufficient funds for the 162 positions. As I understand it, that cut is still inadequate. I do not believe it will abolish one of the inspectors.

Mr. TABER. I doubt if it would. I do not know what their picture is today, but as of the 1st of March they had 973 people. They had an appropriation available for 1,017, indicating they were 4 behind their quota. Now they want to run it up to 1,179; that is, they want the money for it. It would seem to me they would do a great deal better if they would proceed in a little bit more stable way. If the amendment the gentleman from North Carolina has offered were adopted, they would not only have plenty of money but it would be a warning to them to stop doing the things they are doing and wasting the money that is given to them.

(Mr. LONG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time in order to make abundantly clear that the statement made by the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER], and to which he received an affirmative answer, is not in accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, as I understand it. My understanding is that the gentleman proposes to permit an increase of \$1,194,000 which, according to the language of the hearings on page 111, would provide for replacement primarily of scientific equipment, but that the entire number of additional positions, 162, would be eliminated through the gentleman's amendment eliminating \$1,327,000.

It seems to me that we must recognize that this Nation for a number of years has been going through a rapid evolutionary process in the foods and drugs consumed by the American people. There are new techniques of preparation. You buy complete meals from the freezer at the grocery store today. There are new methods of preparing and preserving. The greater portion of the medicines that are being prescribed today are of very recent development. If ever there were a time when we needed to pay the most diligent attention to the character and caliber of the foods and drugs consumed it is during this period of rapid development of new processes and techniques.

We see it all about us in all things connected with science and industry. We are a dynamic Nation and a dynamic people. We have learned over the period of a great many years that you cannot leave it to the judgment of men who must seek profit to police or regulate themselves properly. You must provide expert enforcement, expert examination of these projects if protection is to be afforded the American people.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I wonder if the gentleman understands that this agency now has authority for over 1,000 positions, but up through February 28, 1957, it was able to employ only 973 people. One reason I offered my amendment is that I do not think that by simply giving them the money they will be able to fill the new positions. They did not fill them when they had the money. They are not up to the authorization for 1957. Moreover, 45 of the positions are not inspectors to be used in the field, anyway, but are departmental.

Mr. MOSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that because they cannot recruit these people we should adopt the negative attitude of not providing the funds to seek them out?

I recognize in this field of technical personnel that our Federal Government is lagging dangerously today not only in this instance but throughout the Defense Department and throughout those areas where we have responsibility for research and development of new technology. We are lagging because we refuse to face reality and pay the price which is being offered by competitive forces in private industry. We are not

saving money when we try to economize through that avenue.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from North Carolina, they are up and above the allowed 5 percent lapse in authorized positions. They are authorized for this fiscal year 1,017 and they had on the payrolls as of the end of February 1973. So 5 percent of 1,000 would be 50. They are only 2½ percent off when they are allowed a leeway of 5 percent. So they are doing much better than most Federal operations are now as far as filling positions is concerned. They should be commended for it.

Mr. MOSS. Even if the gentleman from North Carolina is correct as to the difficulty in recruiting, it seems to me that we should intensify our efforts to recruit rather than cut out funds to provide the manpower needed to do this job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the arguments seem to have drifted off from a consideration of the amendment. So far as I know, no one would do away with the Food and Drug Department. It has done a very fine job in many ways. But it is by no means free from error or its employees considerate of the people's interests. Some have swelled heads for which even the agency has not found a remedy. That is not the issue here today. What I think we are trying to do on our side of the aisle is to get a little more efficiency, a little more commonsense into its practices. This last statement was: "They have more money than they used"—and the only answer you make—I refer to the gentleman from California, my very dear friend [Mr. Moss]—the only answer he makes is that they should try to hire some more men—speed up their employment program. My point is that we should keep a little closer watch on what this agency is doing. Weed out the officious and arbitrary as well as the inefficient. Let me give you two illustrations and that with full knowledge that probably the Department is just as clean and just as efficient as any group can be. But they are still not careful enough. In my hometown we happen to have a chemical manufacturing company that manufactures drugs. Some years ago they accused the firm of mislabeling their product. So they said, I was in the picture myself—know whereof I speak. The firm said to the Drug Department—and I passed on the request—"You tell us where these labels we are using are wrong and what should be printed on them. We will give you an analysis of what is in the package." You tell us what label will meet your requirements. Do you know what the

Department's answer was? It said: "You go ahead and print your labels, put them on your products, and then we will check to see when your merchandise gets in intrastate commerce." That does not sound sensible and it was not sensible. This firm was and is in Michigan. It is 75 miles from the Indiana line. We said, "You go into our warehouse and into our factory and take samples—every item is on the shelf." They said, "No; it was not in interstate commerce yet" and, of course, it was not. So we said, "We will ship these down to South Bend, Elkhart, Mishawaka, any place across the State line, and you seize it and examine it." They would not do that. They said, "No. We will seize it wherever we can find it." They said, "We will go all over the United States and we will take our samples wherever we find your merchandise and analyze them." And they did. We all know what effect that had on the business. You know what that meant, do you not? Did it cut into their business? Why, of course, it did. And it destroyed their business in some small communities. Let me give you another example. It took us months to get this one straightened out with the State and never completely with the Department. Any of you people who have ever canned fruit or eaten canned fruit in the old days know that practically every can had mold on top of it. Did it not? Sure, it did. Was it harmful? Mother used to skim it off. Sure, that is the way we fixed that. But what did the Department do? It just happens in Michigan one of our important crops was and is black raspberries. They are canned under the most sanitary conditions. But in the raspberries as they are picked if there is any moisture at all in the air, and of course over next to Lake Michigan there is always some, there is a little mold. Mold as the berries grow. There is no claim that the mold was harmful. It could not be seen. It could not be tasted. It could not be detected by smell. No claim was made that it was harmful. It could be detected only by an expert aided with a powerful microscope. But the Department seized thousands of dollars worth of the canned berries.

Did you ever go into one of these high-priced places in Washington and order a high-priced steak? It was not any good was it until there had been a little mold in it someplace? Did you ever see any good cheese that did not have mold in it somewhere?

And yet they said to our people: "Listen. We will not inspect those berries as they come into the plant. We will not inspect them as they go into the can." We asked them to. They said: "No, we are going out on the market and buy a can," and they did. Then they took the whole shipment and destroyed it or permitted it to be used in some institution.

That does not sound like commonsense, but if you wish and will drop me a letter I will refer you to the page reference of the record where you will find all this set out.

This particular agency should make a little more effort in policing, try for a

little better service from some of its agents.

Let me repeat, no doubt that agency is just as efficient as the average organization, and does some good, but the harm those agents do to innocent people in their services cannot be calculated, is seldom understood. So if we give them a little advice and criticism now—and they still have money—as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] said, they still have money, perhaps they will be a little more careful in their selection of agents. For some strange and unknown reason put a star, a badge on or give a Federal employee a card with his picture and name on it, and forthwith he becomes in his own mind at least, a very superior person.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I did not believe that the Republicans would be offering to cut this particular appropriation. It reminds me of the comments made by the President in his press conference yesterday regarding their long-established domestic programs that people expect to be maintained. Let me tell you why. I read from the front page of this morning's New York Times quoting the President:

A good deal of futile and fatuous talk is going on about reduction in spending that could be made only if Congress were prepared to follow through or to cripple long-established domestic programs that people expected to be maintained.

This is the program for which we agreed a year ago to provide the first installment for an orderly increase, spread over a period of several years because we had received so many complaints that this organization was not keeping pace with the number of new drugs that were coming on to the market every year during the past 10 years. This agency was actually cut a few years ago as far as personnel was concerned. So when Mrs. Hobby was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare she got so concerned, because of the interest of the people throughout the country, that she appointed a committee in 1955 to study this and make recommendations as to what should be done. The list of the members appears on page 62 of last years' hearings. You find on that committee men like Mr. G. Cullen Thomas, vice president of General Mills, Inc.; Mr. Frank W. Abrams, former chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; Dr. Harry Dowling, professor of medicine of the University of Illinois; Mr. Charles Wesley Dunn, president of the Food Institute, Inc.; Mr. Robert A. Hart, vice president of Hoffman-La Roche Co., Inc.; Dr. Charles Franklin Poe, dean of the College of Pharmacy of the University of Colorado; Mr. Walter F. Silbersack, president of the American Home Products Co.; Judge Patrick T. Stone, United States judge of the United States district court for Wisconsin; and Mr. H. Gregory Thomas, president of Channel, Inc.

I do not know if there is a Democrat in that group appointed by Mrs. Hobby, but I presume by the positions they hold

that most are Republicans. They came up with a unanimous report that this agency was completely understaffed because of the increase in the number of drugs that have been developed in the last 10 years, and because of the increased use of chemicals to foodstuffs to keep them longer and other developments that add to this agency's work. Some of these products had actually killed a few people. Because of this they recommended a threefold to fourfold increase in a 5- to 10-year period.

All your committee is recommending today is to follow out the recommendations of that private citizens committee appointed 3 years ago which came up with an unanimous report. As a matter of fact, the amount carried in the bill falls a little short of even doing that.

The amendment that the gentleman from North Carolina has offered disrupts that going program that, as the President says, the people expected to be maintained. It disrupts a program that we started last year. Last year was the first increase we gave them under these recommendations. We allowed them, not more, but slightly less than what the special committee has recommended because of the increase in population, the increase in the sale of dangerous drugs on the market, and because of the increase in the number of these quacks that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long] so eloquently spoke about a short time ago.

When it comes to spending money, this involves only \$9 million. But do you know what you are spending for just the inspection of meat in this country? Do you know what you are taking out of the Federal Treasury to inspect one food article—meat? You are going to be asked this year to spend \$18 million out of the Federal Treasury to inspect meat in this country and I am not saying that is too much, I am in favor of proper meat inspection, but if you are going to spend \$18 million to inspect meat, is it not fair to assume that \$9 million that we have recommended to you, that will save lives and save people from making the fruitless expenditures that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long] has spoken about today, is reasonable? That to me makes commonsense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Is it not fair to assume that we ought to spend at least half as much for the entire field of inspection of foodstuffs, drugs and cosmetics that are being used by 170 million people at this time? It is the only agency in Government today that has jurisdiction and inspection services covering these foods and drugs. They examine these drugs before they come on the market. Every once in a while during the last several years because of the lack of staff, a certain drug has gotten on the shelves at the market place and they have killed people. Then it was the Food and Drug Administration that went in. They went in immediately

and secured those drugs from the drugstores, destroyed them, and thereby saved thousands of lives.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Permit me to thank the gentleman for taking some of our fear away from us. No one is criticizing the overall operation of this department. The gentleman, when he read the names of those able and distinguished gentlemen who had endorsed some report, said they were Republicans. Does the gentleman think that is any reason why we on this side should vote for it?

Mr. FOGARTY. I just wanted to remind the distinguished gentlemen that this committee consisted of members of his own party. I thought perhaps the gentleman had some friends among them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President had some friends among them?

Mr. FOGARTY. No—you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I might have on that side?

Mr. FOGARTY. On this committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just do not get it. Let me ask this question. Several times our attention has been called to what the President said yesterday about cutting the budget and what we were doing. I do not know what the purpose was. As for myself I can only say that I will go along with him whenever I can and the only place we disagree, so far as I know, is as to where the cuts are to be made. I am not going along with him on this foreign aid business, for instance. He may think I am endangering the national security when I refuse to go along with him. I will not go along with Federal aid to education, but, at the same time, I do not charge the President with being ignorant.

Mr. FOGARTY. One of the other things they have accomplished is to stop some of these quacks. For instance, one is the Hoxie Clinic that has been operating in Dallas, Tex., for some years, but finally moved to the State of Pennsylvania. They were able to convict them because he had a fake cure for cancer.

He was using a chemical they called potassium iodide that in many instances incited cancer or irritated an early case of cancer. As a result of their persistent efforts over a period of several years and going to court, they finally have almost put this man out of business. He charged an average of about \$500 a case, and thousands and thousands of Americans have been fleeced because of that type of operation.

Now, a few years ago, you remember, a medicine called Hadakol was the rage all over the country. It was manufactured by a fellow from Louisiana. I saw him on television one night, and he was asked "What will Hadakol do for me?" And his answer was, "I don't know what it will do for you, but it made \$5 million for me." We asked the Food and Drug people what was in Hadakol, because everybody was buying it, and the only thing that was in it was 12 percent alcohol that made you feel a little good if you drank enough of it.

Now, this Mountain Valley Water that my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] talks about that was bottled out in the Midwest, there is nothing wrong with that; it will not kill you, but they inferred that it would cure everything from arthritis to gall bladder trouble; that it would cure almost anything but cancer. And, they were selling it on that basis. That is the reason the Food and Drug Administration did spend \$50,000 to \$60,000 in an attempt to show the public that this was not so; that this Mountain Valley Water would not cure arthritis; it would not cure kidney trouble; it would not cure bladder trouble. That is the reason that they went into that field.

Now, to summarize this I would like to tell you what this cut will mean.

To reduce the appropriation recommended by the committee would disavow the findings and recommendations of a group of distinguished Americans who emphatically urge the expansion of the Food and Drug Administration for the safety and health of all our citizens.

The Food and Drug Administration would be unable to cope with many quack cancer cures so widely publicized which continue to victimize the public every day.

Any curtailment in checking the safety of the flood of new drugs produced and needed by the sick will be disastrous to young and old alike. This includes the use of tranquilizers—happy pills—of which 34 million prescriptions were processed last year.

Would you take the responsibility for stopping seizure of fraudulent devices claimed to cure heart disease, arthritis, etc.? Cutting personnel required to protect you, your families and friends from this menace is unconscionable.

Food poisoning is an ever-present threat to all of us whether by spray on crops, rat infestation, or the addition of chemicals to precooked or frozen foods. You cannot reduce the personnel required to inspect the plants, facilities, and scientifically examine products consumed by our rapidly growing population.

The public demands and the regulated industries support the Food and Drug Administration in safeguarding the American people against contaminated or misrepresented foods and drugs.

To deny the Food and Drug Administration the personnel and facilities recommended by the Committee is false economy, and a potential risk to the lives of every family in the United States.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I don't relish the idea of opposing my good friend from North Carolina, but this is a matter of life and death we are dealing with in this amendment. For more than 30 years I was a practicing pharmacist. I spent many years in the business before we developed any inspection that would give protection to the public at large. My years go back to the days when you could dispense across the counter drugs such as morphine and many other dangerous drugs. The druggists of this country, the drug manufacturers, and the Federal

Government have cooperated in building the food and drug inspection to a point where today every American citizen should deeply appreciate this service.

With the fast development of the industry, many changes have come about. Products today sold over the counter in drugstores come from the manufacturers here in America at an estimated rate of some 10,000 or more a day. These products supposedly should be tested and approved before the public spends its money for them, based on some enticing advertisement. Shampoos, cold creams, and drugs by the thousands are packaged as new products daily.

The fact is that the agency has never had enough inspectors to meeting this growing increase in products for the protection of the public. Some States, including my own, have some inspection, but it is not broad enough nor does the average drugstore have the equipment to satisfy the druggist that a product is safe to sell to the public.

Not only has this agency protected the public at large, but it has caused the druggist and the dispenser of products to feel safer in serving his customers.

I wish every Member of this House could take a short visit through the laboratories down here in the old Agriculture Building. Only one trip would convince you that this is one of the finest acts ever placed on the statute books of any country for the public health and safety of its citizens. Shampoos and cold creams and many other items which are not for internal consumption but only for application externally are tested on animals in the laboratories. You can see with your own eyes there animals with all their fur completely gone, eyes out, and big splotches of sores which have been created by the application of some product, which can be a liquid or a creamy substance or some other type. Certainly, we have what I believe to be one of the most reputable and high-type group of manufacturers in the world today, but there are still hundreds and thousands of greedy people who desire to and do get rich quickly by putting out a dangerous product that is not safe for use internally as well as externally.

The agency has never had the personnel to completely inspect all items, but it has done an outstanding job with what Congress has given it. Comparatively speaking, it is a small agency of our Government, but it has a fine record of accomplishment.

Dispensing drugs is a serious responsibility, and the citizen at large expects the dispenser to advise him safely and soundly. The determination of purity of a product can only be handled by the Federal Government, in my opinion.

I know that every Member of this House depends on his druggist to advise him as safely as his doctor would as to the medicine he requires when ill. It is one of the greatest and safest things we can do for the public to provide this inspection. I could go into hundreds and even thousands of cases I have seen with my own eyes. Drugs today are more potent and are really dangerous if not properly inspected and properly administered. It is impossible to go into

all the details in such a short period of time as I have. Members of the House, we have a solemn obligation to protect the public which today in general has a limited knowledge as to the science of chemistry. Two chemicals placed in a potion or in a solid can create an entirely different substance which can remove all the hair from your head or create turns on a small infant whose mother has purchased in good faith the article used.

There are many packaged articles today on the shelves of the average grocery store where no knowledge whatever exists as to the chemical property of the items. Shampoos and many other articles are sold across the counter of the grocery store today. There is no way to protect the public under present conditions except to have full and proper inspection of such products.

The druggists of this country have been and are wholeheartedly behind the Food and Drug Inspection Department, so far as I know. If it did not exist, in my opinion, the greedy individuals of this country would jeopardize the public health seriously and tragically. We have an obligation to every person in America to insure that the product he purchases should be safe for human consumption and use.

Mr. FOGARTY has gone into and pointed out many of the things that have happened in regard to these dangers. Tranquilizing drugs have come into the market recently, as well as antibiotics, histamines, and synthetic drugs of all descriptions. Useful they are in many ways, but they should be given strict inspection. I could name many more, but I will not trespass upon the time of the House.

One other point I would like to mention, with the indulgence of the Members. We are entering into an entirely new field which today is not very well known. We are dispensing radioisotopes in the hospitals and at many other points. We are even using Cobalt-60, which at the present time is being used to treat carcinoma and many other types of growing cancer cells. As far as I know, there is no other agency of the Government which can protect the safety of the treatment of diseases that stem from the splitting of the atom. Certainly we can commend those for the development of these new products that can alleviate human suffering. And this small group in the Food and Drug Administration will necessarily have to take on this problem for the safety of the American public. Many of these products have already appeared in places for the treatment of disease—hospitals, drugstores, laboratories throughout the entire country. I believe you will agree with me that we should provide the public with safe information as to the use and administration of these products, and to do so we must provide this agency of the Government with qualified personnel, adequate to insure safety to the public.

Certainly, this agency does not deal with drugs alone, but must also give to the public advice as to the safety of foods and many other items that are

necessary to sustain human life as well as safety.

One last word and I will conclude. This bill carries \$9,300,000 for the Food and Drug Administration. The request is \$2,520,000 over the amount appropriated for 1957. With the fast-growing duties placed on this agency, I am of the definite opinion that this is a reasonable request, and I am convinced that the recommendation by the committee is justified, and I personally would like to see this inspection by the agency carried on to a point where no product, edible or for the treatment of disease, would not be fully inspected at the time it is placed on the shelves for sale for human consumption or use.

Gentlemen, I ask you to defeat this amendment for the sake of the health and safety of our American people, as well as those in other countries to which we export drugs and related products.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the 83d Congress I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill on pesticides was before that subcommittee. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina was interested in it and the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] was interested in it. We had quite a bit of testimony. A couple of gentlemen that were named by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] testified before our committee with reference to this bill.

Now I think we are getting to the position again, as we did yesterday, that we are creating agencies without planning out in the beginning exactly how much personnel it is going to take to get this job done. During that time that I was chairman of the subcommittee I asked the Department if it was going to take any increase in personnel, because they were already in the pesticide field. The Department said they would have to have some more personnel. We provided in the bill for certain charges which are placed in a revolving fund. Those employees are paid for with those funds at no expense to the taxpayer—that is, in the pesticide field. Beyond this, it was my understanding that this job would not take any more personnel.

Now I turn to page 10 of the report which accompanies this bill and I find these words:

The citizens committee recommended that personnel and facilities be increased threefold to fourfold within 5 to 10 years. At the rate provided for in the bill it will take a minimum of 10 years to somewhat less than treble the personnel and facilities.

This is a different story when we come to an appropriations bill and find that this is the trend. There was no evidence before our committee that more personnel was needed in this Department in order to handle what was set out in the bill that was before us, other than that in the revolving fund charges.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not quite correct. When

you get into the pesticide field, most of that work is paid for out of a revolving fund that has been a going thing for some years. The expanded program that we are talking about has nothing to do with the field of pesticides at all. It is on the overall program that we are talking about.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] just where these reductions are going to come that he proposes in his amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference where they come. There are four programs. If my amendment is agreed to, there will still be enough money in the bill to maintain operations at or above the 1957 level, to pay for the civil-service retirement contribution and all mandatory increases. And there will be additional money in the amount of \$775,000 over and above that.

Now they propose to put on 162 new persons. They also propose to open a new office in Detroit and to replace what they say is old and obsolete equipment. They can use the extra money for new inspectors, if they want to, or they can use it to replace equipment. My amendment does not tell them where to spend the money. My idea was to eliminate the funds for the new positions but that is not mandatory or in any way required by the amendment. They can use the funds for new inspectors if the need is greater there than for the new equipment. Remember that the amendment increases by funds available in 1957 by \$1,194,000 and only \$419,000 is required to discharge mandatory increases, leaving \$775,000 for use in obtaining new inspectors or restoring obsolete equipment.

Mr. SPRINGER. If they apply this increase which the gentleman has left in the bill to personnel, how many personnel would it provide, out of the 162?

Mr. JONAS. It would depend on how many people they could hire for the difference between \$1,194,000 and \$419,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, the gentleman's proposal would provide roughly about one-third of 162 or something over 50?

Mr. JONAS. If they wanted to use the money to hire more personnel, they could do so, or they could buy equipment.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. That brings us to the point that was raised a few minutes ago when the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was on the floor. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] has not specified that personnel shall be cut. The personnel would not have to be cut. They could still employ the total number, 162, if the Department thought that was wise and necessary.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] stated that we are maintaining

the level of this appropriation at that which they had for the fiscal year 1957. What assurance can the gentleman from North Carolina give us that the industries of this country which manufacture foods and drugs will not increase their output above what it was in 1957 and that therefore no more people would be needed?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me to answer that?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. When I said we were maintaining the level of last year I meant, and should have said, no cuts are being contemplated below the 1957 level.

Mr. YATES. Are any cuts being contemplated in the industries that are being surveyed by this administration?

Mr. JONAS. I am anxious for the gentleman to understand that the amendment does not contemplate any cutback whatsoever below 1957 levels and, in fact, will permit an increase.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. In connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER], there is a lot of confusion because the gentleman from North Carolina when he offered the amendment stated specifically that this amendment would not allow them to hire 1 additional person of the 162 they had asked for. When the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] made the same inquiry of the gentleman from North Carolina he said, "That is right; not one additional person will be hired under my amendment."

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say this in reply to what has been said: It certainly will be my position if I am ever the chairman of the subcommittee involving a thing like this again to be sure I know where we were going to go with personnel when we created additional legislation calling for new Government responsibilities. That is the fundamental question involved here if you are going to keep your expenditures under control.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. May I point out that in Detroit at the present time there are two inspectors for the lower peninsula of Michigan. The food-packaging plants are inspected once every 10 years and the drug-packaging plants once every 5 years. I am not for any cut that is going to cut out anybody there, but I want some increases so that we can inspect in Detroit and in Michigan to an extent that protects the health of our people.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think everybody in this House agrees with the gentleman on that. It is a question, of course, how much can be done by these people who are on the rolls.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would assume the State of Michigan as well as other States has certain food inspectors.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am not familiar with that. They do in the State of Illinois; not on drugs, but they do have them on food. I cannot say as far as the State of Michigan is concerned.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. A citizens' report pointed out in 1954 that there was an inspection of food packing plants in this country once every 60 years and of drug packaging plants something like once every 10 years. Michigan is a little better off than the general average of the country, but it is still not good enough.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one of vital importance to every American in connection with our health and the protection of our health. The mere fact that they are trying to reduce the appropriation a little over \$300,000 is not the question involved, it is the effect on the protection of the health of Americans that is involved.

This amendment will be followed later on, today or tomorrow or Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday or Thursday of next week, whenever this bill is disposed of, by other amendments in relation to appropriations for medical research, all connected with the future wellbeing of our people. The remarks I make on this occasion in connection with this amendment would be applicable to the other amendments that will follow, all of which I hope, with this amendment, will be defeated.

There is a very interesting and fundamental question confronting the Members of the House in relation to this appropriation bill. We saw the cuts made in the Department of Labor, of vital importance to countless millions of people throughout the country who toil with their hands or use their brains in connection with their employment. We find the cuts made with a great majority of the Republican Members voting for them. We find the cuts made in the Department where the man who is the head of it, Secretary Mitchell, is the most effective Republican in the executive branch of the Government, outside of President Eisenhower himself, in campaigning for the Republican Party.

We now come to another important aspect of this appropriation bill—the protection of health and also later appropriations relating to the health of all of our people because none of us know when we are going to get sick. None of us know when a serious illness might be visited upon us. We all know there are many, many millions of Americans handicapped as the result of serious illnesses whether it be a heart ailment, rheumatism, cancer or anything else. Everyone knows that the appropriations we have made in past years have made a

powerful contribution in the field of medical research for the benefit and advancement of human beings not only for the people of America, but for people all over the world.

Here we have an unusual situation where it is most outstanding and noticeable. In fact, it is historic. The President held a press conference on Wednesday last. As I interpret the President's remarks, he certainly must have been very embarrassed because he was forced to defend his own budget which he had sent to the Congress. This is his budget. This is not merely a recommendation. He was forced to defend his own budget because of the rebellion against him by the majority of his own Members in this body. The President said that his budget had been drawn up, and I quote: "Carefully, intelligently." How historic it is that a President feels that he is on trial and must defend himself to the point of having to say that his budget has been drawn up "carefully, intelligently." The President also used in his press conference the word "futile," and I quote that in connection with cutting the budget as he said, "severely"; that too big a cut in foreign aid, for example, would endanger the country's national interest. I called that to the attention of the country some weeks ago when I was on the television program conducted by our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I projected my mind ahead. Drawing on my years of experience in Government, I said, "Where can the sharp cut come?" It must come along the lines of least resistance. My mind focused on foreign assistance—not that I approve of that method but I saw that that was the easiest way. When Secretary Humphrey started the revolt, when the executive budget was sent up, that was the time the President should have acted. Humphrey's revolt became contagious and it is now a revolution among the great majority of the Republican Members. President Eisenhower said he took the responsibility for his budget. Well, we got that out of him anyway. He has his responsibility to try and stop cuts being made that will affect our national interests. He will have to do something more than make statements in a press conference. He will have to go to work and he will have to go to work among his own Republican Members and Republican leadership.

The President ought to know that in the committees and in the House of Representatives practically all the members of his own party are the ones who are attacking his budget and by their votes they are showing that they do not believe his budget was drawn up, and I quote again "carefully, intelligently." The President leads one way and his army in the House of Representatives goes the other way. What a picture. And who do they think they are fooling? It is not my responsibility to give President Eisenhower advice—I, the Democratic leader, as to how he should meet the situation.

One thing is certain, when a Democrat was President he at least had the majority of his own party supporting him,

not by words "I like so and so," but by votes.

What is happening on this bill? Sniping to date is only minor and the forerunner of what will happen later on in relation to other appropriation bills. The President had better evaluate what is going on now in terms of what might happen later when bills come up containing appropriations necessary to carry out his foreign policy. This is the time for him to assert leadership among his own party and try to get a part of his own party to support him. This will require action on his part, getting his own leadership to take the floor and fight against the revolution that might well lead to serious consequences. The President must talk personally or over the telephone with all the members of his own party or the leadership to try to have them see that his budget that was drawn up, and I quote, "Carefully, intelligently."

This amendment that is pending we all know is a vital amendment, as I said, in connection with the health of the people of our country. It will be followed by other amendments to reduce medical research.

I hope enough of my Republican friends will cooperate with some of us on the Democratic side so that we will give to the President the consideration to which he is entitled when he said that his budget was drawn up—and I quote again—"carefully, intelligently."

How mortifying it must have been to him to find it necessary to make that statement when he knows in his own heart, if he will admit it, that the cause of it is Secretary Humphrey, because he started into operation a chain of events that has led up to the situation that exists. Each and every one of us knows it. Weeks ago, on the program to which I have referred, conducted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], I also said that if that does happen "the President can either thank or blame as he sees fit Secretary Humphrey."

The time is now for the President to assert his leadership on this particular bill. Later on it may be too late.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been thinking for the last few days, especially when I have heard speeches like the one we have just listened to, from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that too much emphasis is being said by the opposition about the President's budget. This, in fact, is Congress' budget.

Some of you were diligently adding every expense to our Government just as soon as you got control by a majority back in 1955 and in 1956 for the past 2 years.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I do not yield now. I will yield later if I can.

I have been led to believe from the speeches of the majority leader over the past 3 or 4 years that the cardinal policy of the Democratic Party, was to add so much expense to the Government that when we came into the 1956 campaign that we would not be able to keep our

promise to the people not only to give them a tax reduction, but at the same time to balance the Federal budget when it had not been balanced more than once in twenty-some years under the leadership of his party with him on the floor of the House most of the time as the majority leader. You were too busy for the last two decades with your tax-and-spend policy building up bureaucratic government and loading down the people with additional taxes and increasing the national debt.

You do not have to go back farther than the last 2 years to count up probably, if you would get the figures, the \$3 billion that a good many on the floor of the House would like to reduce from this present budget.

This is not President Eisenhower's budget. He was not responsible for advocating legislation that would increase this budget, in my judgment, by many billions of dollars. It was because of the authorizations, because of your passing new laws and amending the law here and there which would add millions of dollars to the budget in the hope of making the people happier back home. You remember the social security law that was passed last year, which is adding about \$300 million a year to the budget and will continue for years to come. I remember the money that you forced the Department of Defense to take, some \$990 million last year, and I remember when you increased the wages of everybody who wanted an increase in wages, and you readily voted for them, but when it came time to vote to increase the postal rates to take care of the increased wages you placed upon the Government, not many of you had the courage to stand up and vote for an increase in the postal rates to help pay for the burden you had put on the Government.

You continue to talk about President Eisenhower's budget. We on the Republican side of the House for a good many years have been voting just like we are voting now, to reduce Government spending. With the support of a number of great Democrats on your side of the House, even when we were in the minority, we were able to cut President Truman's budget year after year. We have not changed our policy and we are standing firm in trying to see if we cannot tighten up this budget now in the interest of the people.

May I say that a few weeks ago the gentleman from Massachusetts who leads the party on your side of the House was the one who was crying for a reduction in the President's budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. VURSELL) he was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, in my judgment, one of the best things that ever happened to this country in the 14 years I have been privileged to sit in this House was the election of President Eisenhower. We took the budget then \$9.6 billion dollars in the red and with the help of some good Democrats, many of them react to good legislation and disregard politics,

we, the Republicans, were able to reduce that budget by \$10 billion. We were able to give the people a tax reduction and, yes, we were able to balance the budget twice over the opposition, I would say, of the majority leader who has just been speaking on the subject from this same rostrum. We have established honesty, integrity, and efficiency in Government. What we all ought to do is to cooperate with the President. I am sure he wants this budget reduced where it can justifiably be done and I am sure he is willing to trust our judgment if we will do it in a selective, workmanlike manner, and that is what we are trying to do. It is not the meat-ax approach so far as we on this side of the aisle are concerned. We want to protect the interests of 160 million people who are crying out because for the past 20 years there has been so much legislation put on the statute books that has driven up the cost of government so high that we are having to take an undue amount of money in taxes out of the economy of this country. That cannot always go on. And, that is about the only thing that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, one of the greatest Secretaries that this country has ever had, had to say about this budget. I am glad that the Secretary spoke up, and I think we are getting cooperation along that line and will continue to get cooperation from those in high places in the present administration.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, surely the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is not only a kindly but an intelligent man and surely he realizes that, under the Constitution of the United States, President Eisenhower signed and approved each and every law in the past 4 years. The Constitution of the United States provides that—

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States. If he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.

Now, I do not recall any moneysaving veto messages in the past 4 years from President Eisenhower, so I think the American public should know that he approved each and every one of these costly laws the gentleman referred to, during the past 4 years, and the most costly ones were those proposed by him and his administration.

The gentleman from Illinois also stated that this was not President Eisenhower's budget. How can he make such a statement? The law provides—title 31, United States Code, section 11—that the President of the United States shall transmit to the Congress the budget which shall set forth the "estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary in his judgment for the support of the Government." I repeat

the words "necessary in his judgment." The highest peacetime budget in history is here with President Eisenhower's certification that it is all necessary in his judgment. In effect, he has certified that he does not know how to cut it.

It might be interesting if I called the attention of our friends on that side of the aisle, almost all of whom have been voting for the adoption of all of the amendments throughout the Labor Department part of this bill, to what their great friend and fellow Republican, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, has to say about their actions. I am reading from an Associated Press report which came over the wire just a short while ago this afternoon. I urge all my dear friends to listen carefully:

WASHINGTON.—Secretary Mitchell said today he will use "every means in my power" to get a reversal of House votes to cut \$34 million from the Labor Department's budget.

Mitchell told a news conference his Department's requests were "conservative," adding:

"I propose to defend them to the bitter end."

The administration sought about \$385 million to run the Labor Department in the fiscal year beginning July 1. The House Appropriations Committee trimmed that by \$20 million and the House in the last 2 days has voted cuts of \$14 million more.

The appropriation is still pending before the House as part of a bill carrying funds also for the Welfare Department.

Mitchell said it was one thing for the Appropriations Committee, after full hearings, to make a cut but another thing for the House to overrule the committee's judgment and make a deeper slash.

"In my opinion it's a perversion of the budget process," he said.

Mitchell was asked whether Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's invitation to Congress to cut President Eisenhower's budget requests had made it "tougher" to clear them through Congress.

He replied:

"I don't know what's made it tougher, I know it is tougher."

Now, when you shortly come to vote on this pending amendment which affects the life and health of the people of America, funds for the activities of the Pure Food and Drug Administration, I suggest that more than five of you, which has been about the average on the adopted amendments to the Labor Department part of this bill, stand up and be so reckless as to support President Eisenhower and your Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it has been interesting at least to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts accuse the Republicans of failing to legislate as they think they should. It is my understanding that the Democrats have control of the House. They have a majority of somewhere around 30, do they not, I will ask the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ROONEY. It is either 32 or 33.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then how is it that you can criticize the Republicans for putting through the amendments when the Democrats have a majority of 32? What is the matter with your party discipline? You charge us with deserting the Presi-

dent—when you have full control of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman realize that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] was talking about laws which were passed in the 83d Congress? Was that not a Republican Congress?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course it was. But he was talking about the laws passed in the last 20 years.

Mr. ROONEY. It was in the 83d Congress that Vice President Nixon went down to Central America, came back and demanded a crash program of \$75 million for the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What has that to do with the reductions which has been made during the last 2 days and which could not have been made if the Democrats had all voted against them. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. When President Eisenhower came into office it is my recollection that they, the Democrats time and again, pledged support to the President. Now they say that they support his budget. But they have a majority of the votes; why do they not cast them in support of all the items carried in the budget? Why cry about what the House is doing when they have a clear majority of more than 30.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 85, noes 96.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONAS and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 216, Rept. No. 286), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4136) to extend the period within which

Export-Import Bank of Washington may make loans. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 217, Rept. No. 287), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided

and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

(Mr. COAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I had intended today to introduce a bill which would call for an amendment of the Agricultural Act of 1949. My bill would have required the Commodity Credit Corporation to replenish its stocks of commodities sold on the open market, because of deterioration or spoilage. My belief was that if this bill were enacted, it would raise the price of farm commodities almost overnight.

At the present time, I am convinced through reliable sources of information that the Commodity Credit Corporation is selling grains on the open market in voluminous amounts, and that this policy is depressing market prices. This operation is one which the Commodity

Credit Corporation is continuing by right of what is believed to be an escape clause in the Agricultural Act of 1949, which permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell these commodities on the open market when they have "substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage"—Reference 407, Agricultural Act, 1949 as amended. I am certain that we are well aware of the fact that this has been and is now the means by which the Commodity Credit Corporation has been selling large amounts of corn on the open markets.

Upon an investigation of this matter, I learned that on Monday of this week, of a total of 600 carloads of corn received on the Chicago market, 480 of these cars came from Commodity Credit stocks. On the following day, Tuesday, March 26, a total of 130 carloads of corn were received on the Chicago market, of which 98 came from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

I have received information directly from the Department of Agriculture wherein it is reported that domestic dollar sales of corn on the market have been in excess of 24 million bushels during the 6-month period beginning July 1, 1956 and ending December 31, 1956. The complete breakdown of commodity sales is as follows:

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Proceeds from export and domestic dispositions of basic price-support commodities, fiscal year 1957 through Dec. 31, 1956

(In thousands)

	Corn		Cotton		Peanuts		Rice		Wheat ¹		Total proceeds
	Quantity	Proceeds	Quantity	Proceeds	Quantity	Proceeds	Quantity	Proceeds	Quantity	Proceeds	
	Bushels	Dollars	Bales	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Hundred-weight	Dollars	Bushels	Dollars	
Export:											
Dollar sales.....	5,611	\$7,371	5,497	\$684,352	13,000	\$1,006	672	\$2,920	37,490	\$118,543	\$814,192
Barter.....	7,368	10,818	459	56,364			420	1,123	55,524	88,501	156,806
Public Law 480, title I.....	4,385	11,519	175	34,711			6,111	69,675	22,626	72,241	188,146
Public Law 480, title II.....	1,422	3,826					15	171	4,832	15,404	19,401
Sec. 402, ICA.....	249	372							1,022	1,956	2,328
Donations.....	326						1,906		1,579		
Subtotal.....	19,361	33,906	6,131	775,427	13,000	1,006	9,124	73,889	123,073	296,645	1,180,873
Domestic:											
Dollar sales.....	24,491	31,713	45	12,664	51,272	2,265	15,789	86,558	7,665	16,277	149,477
Sec. 32.....							380	4,340			4,340
Donations.....	3,885						34		1,084		
Subtotal.....	28,376	31,713	45	12,664	51,272	2,265	16,203	90,898	8,749	16,277	153,817
Total dispositions.....	47,737	65,619	6,176	788,091	64,272	3,271	25,327	164,787	131,822	312,922	1,334,690

¹ Includes bushel equivalent of wheat flour.

The entire idea and principle involved here is to get the Government out of the grain business for whenever the Government simply dumps commodities on the market, the only thing that happens is that prices go down. If, however, the Government had to replenish its stocks when a given quantity of a commodity was sold, it would not depress prices. Therefore, in this manner, if the Government replenished its stocks, it would keep the prices of our commodities up, and it would keep the Government out of the grain business in such man-

ner that it is a detriment to the price structure. This plan would in no way affect the export program, and it would not affect any program of the Government for the using of farm commodities for direct relief aid, whether at home or overseas.

I know that the CCC has been selling grains for a long time, and at least during recent months, has been excessive.

I have further information which reveals the fact that an announcement was made on or about November 30, 1956, which was made by officials of the

Commodity Credit Corporation, stating that a large quantity of corn was in danger of going out of condition, and that it would have to be sold on the open market. Certainly, the date of this announcement belies the conditions which obviously existed. Why should corn be in danger of going out of condition on the date of November 30, when the season of high temperatures and high humidity had passed? Another fact which is directly related to this situation is revealed by the knowledge that a big percentage of the corn which is actually received in

the Chicago market, which comes from the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks grades No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3. This certainly cannot be presumed to be corn which is in the immediate danger of spoilage or deterioration. These are the highest grades by which we are able to grade corn. It is the best corn that we have available on any market, and it takes a great stretch of the imagination to attempt to say that this is corn in immediate danger of spoilage.

Now as I said in the beginning, it was my thought to introduce a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to require the Commodity Credit Corporation to replenish its stocks of commodities sold because of deterioration and spoilage. My plan would have permitted the Government to continue to sell its commodities in danger of going out of condition, but also would not have affected the market price, because an equal amount would have been withdrawn from the market.

However, today, upon a more complete investigation, I find that in title 7, section 1427, of the United States Code Annotated, that:

Nor shall the foregoing restrictions apply to sales of commodities the disposition of which is desirable in the interest of the effective and efficient conduct of the Corporation's operations because of the small quantities involved, or because of age, location, or questionable continued storability, but such sales shall be offset by such purchases of commodities as the Corporation determines are necessary to prevent such sales from substantially impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support price for such commodities. (7 U. S. C. A., sec. 1427, as amended.)

Thus I find that my plan is already a matter of law.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Banking and Currency Committee, the committee which originally wrote the charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, should make a thorough and complete investigation of the procedures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to determine whether or not the CCC, in the sales of commodities, as outlined above, has been in violation of the law. I am today introducing a resolution which, if adopted, will give authority to the Banking and Currency Committee to make this investigation and study.

CUTTING THE BUDGET

(Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], chairman of the subcommittee handling the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, now before the House, say on Tuesday and yesterday and again today that we will have rollcalls on the amendments adopted to the bill which reduce the appropriation as approved by the Appropriations Committee. As one who has consistently tried to vote for economy ever since I have been a Member of this body, I am

not only willing to go on record on each amendment adopted but wish the rules of the House would permit a rollcall on the amendments that are defeated.

We have heard a lot of talk by many Members contending that they are for economy. I trust that we are not merely giving lipservice to the effort to achieve real economy in the Federal Government. I feel that without exception every department and agency can take a reasonable cut without in any way impairing the necessary and needed function of the particular agency provided there is a real and actual effort made by the individual departments and agencies to effect economy and efficiency.

A number of us have been on the floor of the House during the entire time this bill has been under consideration. I say here and now to the Members of this body who desire to reduce the appropriations contained in this bill that the only way a reduction can be achieved is for you to stay here during the entire time the bill is under consideration. If you do not stay and we fail to carry an amendment, there is no way that under the present rules of the House to have a rollcall vote on the amendments that are not adopted.

We were successful Tuesday and Wednesday in passing every amendment that was offered to reduce the amount appropriated in the bill but one. The alarming fact, however, is that when the votes were taken yesterday the largest number of Members on the floor at any one time was around 230. I desire to remind the membership and to put them on notice that it is necessary, if we are to achieve any success in cutting this bill, that they be on the floor of this House at all times when this measure is under consideration.

I want to say to the chairman of the subcommittee that he has been most patient and cooperative in handling the bill on the floor of this House but I also want to say that a number of us welcome the opportunity of rollcalls on the amendments adopted which reduced the appropriations in the bill. I am convinced that these amendments will be a step in the right direction in trying to make the departments involved operate in an efficient manner so that the taxpayers of this country might have some relief in the years that lie ahead. Unless somewhere along the line we call a halt on all of the new programs and extensions of the present ones we will soon have the Federal Government taking over all the functions of the States, localities as well as the people.

Mr. Speaker, I think now is the time to face this issue head-on. That I am glad to do and I hope that there are sufficient Members of this House that will join me so we can stop the octopus-like growth of the Federal Government.

THE RECORD OF INACTION OF FARM LEGISLATION

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been several days now since the

House debated and acted upon a bill that would have been of great benefit to the corn farmers of the Midwest. Since that time I have had the opportunity to hear from a number of farm leaders and distinguished citizens of my district and from the general tone of their letters it is quite evident that there is much misunderstanding about what happened to the farm legislation. Almost unanimously these people were disappointed and discouraged because they saw in several of the proposals some real answers to the problems of surpluses that plague the farm economy that now, because of what seems to them is pure politics, they will have to wait at least another year for the consideration of some commonsense solution. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have decided to place in the RECORD the facts about this controversy as I see them. A famous Democrat once said, "Let us look at the record." So I propose to point to the RECORD.

The RECORD shows that 156 Democrats joined with 61 city Republicans to defeat a corn measure that would help farmers in 1957 balance supply with demand. The Democratic forces against the corn bill were led by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, and the ranking member of this committee, Mr. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas. This performance of this leadership of the House Agriculture Committee against corn legislation this year is most interesting when it is realized that the same program they offered farmers and were most responsible for in 1956 has been in effect withdrawn by the same Democratic leadership of the House this year.

This Indian giving is hard to understand. The bill that was before the House which the chairman and the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee supported in 1956 and opposed in 1957 did not increase the cost in 1957 of the price support and soil-bank programs over the options which were offered to corn farmers by the Agricultural Act of 1956. Why did the Democratic leadership of the great Agriculture Committee refuse to help the corn farmers is the paramount question in the minds of the Midwest farmer.

Time and time again, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and other Democrats referred to the fact that \$179 million of soil-bank payments were made in 1956 to corn farmers to reduce production but corn production in 1956 exceeded 1955 by 220 million bushels.

On the opening day of the debate, the chairman of the committee said:

Let us consider what happened last year. Last year Mr. Benson administered the corn program and he gave away \$179 million in soil-bank payments to the commercial corn producers of the Nation. Instead of reducing production we had perhaps the greatest production of feed grains in the history of the Nation. (P. 2825 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. ABERNETHY, Democrat, of Mississippi, and member of the committee, the next day said:

Now we find ourselves with a doubly aggravated situation, even though the Secretary expended \$179 million of soil-bank

money in an effort to head it off. The situation is his own handiwork. Undoubtedly his eye was on the November elections when he upped corn supports last year.

It was obvious from the debate that the amount of money going into the corn area in an election year was particularly disturbing to the chairman and the other members of this party. Yet it was the chairman and the members of his party who forced a soil-bank payment program to be put into effect in 1956 after corn-planting time when he and everyone else must have known that such a program would not contribute to an orderly reduction in production.

The record indicates that after the Congress loaded up the Agricultural Act of 1956 with many obnoxious, costly measures, it was vetoed by the President and that the veto was sustained by most farmers in the Midwest. By that time most authorities believed it was too late to have an effective soil-bank program for 1956. Yet, when the final Soil Bank Act was passed in 1956 the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and the political leaders of his party forced through a payment program for that year against the advice of many authorities on the subject, including the Farm Bureau leaders. It was the Democratic chairman of the Agriculture Committee who had the following to say in urging an amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1956, when it was being considered by the House in 1956:

It might appear that this is a very slight change but it occurs to me that this is a very important change. I believe that we are now actually faced with this situation: Are we going to have a soil-bank program in 1956 or not? I did want to offer this amendment to make it perfectly clear that the House wanted the Secretary to put it into operation in 1956. My amendment is perfectly harmless but it will make it clear that we want him to do it if he can and if he does we want the farmers to receive their payments in 1956.

The ranking member of the Agriculture Committee went on to say:

The Cooley amendment relates to section (b) on page 11 and specifically says in positive words that the Secretary shall make payment in 1956 for compliance with the soil-bank provisions this year, and that this payment shall be made as soon as compliance is determined. Compliance is ordinarily determined along in July and August.

He further explained that the way the law was drafted the farmer had to carry out the program before payments could be made.

Mr. EDMONDSON, Democrat, from Oklahoma, raised the following question:

Can you not boil down the difference between the Hope amendment and the Cooley amendment, considering the provisions of this bill as a whole, to this simple fact? If you are for an effective and operating soil bank that will put 100 percent payments into the pockets of the farmers in 1956 you will be for the Cooley amendment and against the Hope substitute.

Mr. POAGE. Exactly.

The Democrats in 1956, who then, it seemed to many, were seeking political advantage, were extremely anxious to get money paid out in 1956. Now in 1957 they use the payments that were made by the Secretary, which he was forced to do

by law, and which they put into the law as an excuse for withdrawing from the corn farmers an opportunity to have an effective corn program in 1957. The unfairness of this situation is much greater than most people in the Corn Belt can appreciate at this time, but it will become clearer to them as the surplus continues to pile up in all of the price-supported crops. It was the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and Democrats from the South who refused year after year to pass legislation calling for a sound program which would have avoided the feed-grain surplus which is helping to undermine corn and livestock economy of the country. The Representatives from the areas where the basic crops of wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco have almost without exception received what they asked for in the way of price supports and legislation that affected their economy. It is hard for the corn farmer to understand why he is singled out in this manner, so to speak, by inaction—his problems, through inaction, are being ignored by Members of this Congress.

For 2 years in succession now, his problems have been relegated to second or third place, and for 2 years the Representatives from the Midwest, the greatest food-producing area in the world, have had their basic problem postponed until it was too late.

As evidence of this, I cite the following record:

It is a fact that the corn legislation came after the legislation dealing with the drought area and all of us joined in that move because we all, of course, recognized it as an emergency. Then, finally after several weeks, the House of Representatives got to the corn bill and on March 13, 1957, by record vote of 188 yeas to 217 nays, defeated a simple bill designed to permit corn farmers to participate in the kind of program they prefer. This preference, Mr. Speaker, was supported by 61.5 percent of approximately 440,000 farmers voting in the referendum, and in my district, the percent was 65.6 percent. The record shows that most of the majority Members insisted that the acreage reserve program of the soil bank must also be opened up to grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, soybeans, flax seed and non-commercial area corn, and the House refused to pass any of those proposals. The reason, I think, was quite obvious—it would have cost the taxpayers, by conservative figures, at least \$1 billion more than the proposal that was offered by a very large percent of the Representatives from the commercial corn areas, with no real assurance of bringing relief.

One of the tragedies of this experience in Congress is the fact that for the first time almost in all the history of our Congress since we have had a farm block, it was divided. Mr. Speaker, with the farmers today producing all the foods and fibers and representing only at most, 14 percent of the total population—14 makes this situation tragic.

This experience, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, points up more vividly than ever the great challenge and need for taking the farm problem completely out of par-

tisan politics. While I recognize, and all who have ever had anything to do with the farm question recognize the farm problem as one of the most complex and difficult of all our domestic problems, I sincerely feel that the gravity of this situation makes it necessary for us to call upon the best talent available in Congress and out of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, farmers, farm organizations, producers, and consumers, to sit down and work out some kind of a program for the best interest of the farm economy. Ample food, good food from good land use affords high quality food and therefore better health for all our people. Conservation of our natural resources and the conservation of our soil for the production of foods and fibers is the most important business in the preservation and prosperity of the American people and the preservation of the American philosophy.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FOGARTY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FOGARTY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6304) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and for other purposes.

The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand there is a \$50 limitation?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is correct; that is the same as we have done before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of December 5, 1942, entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad," as amended (U. S. C., title 50 App., secs. 846 and 847), is amended to read as follows: "That under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe so much of any shipment as does not exceed \$50 in value, with such further limitation on the importation of alcoholic beverages and tobacco products as the Secretary may prescribe, shall be admitted into the United

resorting to this practice are not affected by the State usury laws, since technically and legally the discount has not been held to be an interest charge.

A demand has been made for an increase in interest rate on VA loans from 4½ to 5 percent. With the discount practice being followed, lenders are now obtaining net interest yields of 5 percent or more in some instances on Veterans' Administration loans. The proposals before the Congress was that the interest rate be raised from 4½ to 5 percent; however, there was no prohibition against discounts in the amendment. Had the amendment been adopted, the veteran would be required to pay the higher rate of 5 percent and the lender would be permitted to obtain all the discount points from the builder or seller that he could obtain. The interest rate was raised in December of 1956 on FHA loans from 4½ to 5 percent. Even with this increase, the discount practice has not disappeared from that class of loans. FHA loans are being made today in many parts of the United States at discounts varying from 3 to 5 points.

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1958

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1957

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know a lot of you are ready to vote. Well, I have been here all day and I was here nearly every other day listening to the debate, so surely you can spare me about 4 or 5 minutes. I am vitally interested in this subject. I have vigorously opposed this Mexican labor bill every time there was any part of it on the floor, and I expect to continue to do that very thing. Many say, "Oh, they pay the same wage for this labor as they do for local labor." That is the same as saying that the veteran does not pay the discount when he buys a home. I live in a district that uses Mexican labor, too, and am familiar with how the program operates. I live in a district where they have been shipping in Hungarian labor also, and I want to talk about that, too, if I have time. But, this Mexican labor comes there and lives in small shacks.

They arrive by the truckload. Just as they ship in livestock, I have seen as many as 30 or 40 packed into 1 flat-bodied truck. They travel all the way from the Mexican border in the trucks and unload at the farm of the contractor. Here

they are domiciliated in tiny shacks which amount to no more than a lean-to shelter. There is no such thing as sanitation or plumbing, and what water they use they haul it in barrels. Many of them do not even to bother to live in these shacks but simply bed down on the ground without any shelter.

Customarily they have a so-called foreman who is able to speak some English, and he is the spokesman for the entire group. He comes to an agreement with the farmer and handles all the money or the group. There is no such thing as wage standards, and no one knows exactly what was paid except the farmer and the foreman. Wage standards and living conditions are thrown out of the window, and it is a matter of each person making the best deal possible. That is the way this program works in the Eighth Congressional District and the adjoining districts in the State of Louisiana.

In my district there are some large plantations, and in other areas there are small farms. In the area where the small farms are predominant the people do some truck farming and raise a small amount of cotton or corn but principally make their living working away from home. A considerable source of employment is on the larger plantations, and this category of labor is being deprived of the opportunity to work by the importation of Mexican labor. The residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana perform an honest day's work and in turn expect to be paid a fair and prevailing wage.

We are all proud of the living standards and conditions in our country, and these conditions are made possible only by payment of a fair wage scale. The entire balance is upset when cheap foreign labor is imported at the expense of many for the benefit of a few.

Apart from the displacement of local labor, I object to the morals of these imported Mexican laborers. My experience with them has been limited, but it is obvious that law-enforcement officers encounter a problem when the Mexican laborers are in any given vicinity. One was understood to make this reply upon learning that he would spend some time in jail for theft, "So what, it's O. K. with me; I will get three meals and a place to sleep."

Let us not misunderstand this thing. I am in support of knocking out the \$2.5 million or any other amount for the importation of Mexican labor or other foreign labor that comes here in competition with local labor. If you want to vote for those few who hire this labor under contract for little or nothing, then vote for it, but do not be misled.

In the little city of Pineville, La., which has less than 10,000 population, there are about 15 Hungarians who have displaced 15 local citizens in jobs within the creosote and other plants.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Before any of this labor can come into this country there must be a certification that local labor

is not sufficient to take care of the needs in the area.

Mr. LONG. The program does not always work as intended. In my area I see every day during the cotton-picking season, the farming season, literally hundreds of good American boys walking the streets begging for jobs while the Mexican labor does the work.

Mr. GATHINGS. Let me tell you what they do in trying to get local labor. They preach the need for labor from the pulpit. They ask for this labor in every conceivable manner to do this work.

Mr. LONG. I am telling you of my experience with this program. I live among these people in my district and I know what is going on.

Mr. GATHINGS. How many of those Mexicans who worked in the gentleman's district were convicted of thievery? We have not experienced too much difficulty from these people. They are peaceful and largely law abiding.

Mr. LONG. I have no way of knowing how many of the Mexican contract laborers have been convicted of thievery but I do know that in every locality where contract labor is used there are complaints and law enforcement officers are kept busy in seeing that these laborers behave themselves.

We want to practice a little economy, and we want to keep the Government out of private business. We want the Government to quit interfering with the farmers and other people who have business to transact. I believe this is a very good place to begin. Stop the wetbacks from coming into this country and if we do not have a treaty to back it up, let us make one.

Adequate Safeguards in Tariff and Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1957

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in many instances the voice of our people first expresses itself in the decisions of our various State Legislatures. A recent action by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a particularly timely and important example of this phenomenon.

Recognizing the many serious dangers to the welfare of American labor and industry resulting from rising trends in imports of foreign products, the general assembly has approved a resolution memorializing Congress to provide adequate safeguards for the legitimate interests of millions of our citizens by adopting appropriate trade and tariff legislation. There is no question in my own mind but that it is absolutely essential to the health of our Nation's economy for the Congress to give serious attention to this vital problem. In adopting this resolution by a near unanimous voice vote of both houses, the assembly has rendered

a great service to the citizens of Pennsylvania and of the Nation.

The resolution as approved is as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS IN TARIFF AND TRADE LEGISLATION

The increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability.

The lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment.

Our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent.

Unemployment caused by the imports of residual oil, which represented 3.43 times the average of 45 million barrels imported in 1946, to approximately 154 million barrels in 1956, or the yearly equivalent of 36,640,000 tons of coal; and unemployment caused by imports of crude oil; various types of glass, steel, aluminum, brass and zinc products; pottery and chinaware; granite, tiles, cement, hardboard, plywood, hardware, plumbing, flat glass, and other building supplies, lace, carpets, and all kinds of woolen, cotton, and synthetic fiber manufactured goods; leather and fabric gloves; bicycles; hydraulic turbines; machine tools and other machinery; heavy electrical equipment and other electrical industry products and electronics; watches, clocks, and parts; optical industry products; cutlery; scientific apparatus; pencils and pens; pins, clips, and fasteners; soft fiber; insulation board and manufactured cork products; chemicals; toys; mushrooms; farm, dairy and dried milk products; wallpaper; hats and millinery; printing industry products; ladies hand bags and leather goods; nails, wire, screws, bolts, and nuts, and many other commodities; will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus eliminated.

Agricultural products such as wheat, wheat flour, cotton, butter, cheese, and peanuts, enjoy the protection of import quotas.

A maximum of satisfactory trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition. Therefore be it

Resolved (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide adequate safeguards in tariff and trade legislation, including import quotas and an effective prohibition against dumping of imports in the United States; against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

School-Aid Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1957

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SCHOOL-AID EXTRAVAGANCE — CONGRESSMAN BOW REVEALS WHAT HAPPENS IN FEDERALLY SUPPORTED SCHOOLS

(By Raymond Moley)

In his pleas for Federal aid for school construction, including his not very successful controversy with the Chamber of Commerce of the United States over the validity of the administration's figures on the need, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Folsom gives every assurance that Uncle Sam will just give the money and look the other way so far as spending is concerned. In short, the impression is given that there will be no Federal control of schools. But isn't such control inevitable, considering the itchy hands of Washington bureaucrats? Would not the Federal Government be under an obligation to be responsible for the grants to the States in this case? Thus the administration is caught in a serious dilemma. It must assure—perhaps should assure—Congress that it will see that the money appropriated is providently spent. And it must, so far as the political exigencies are concerned, assure the States that it will not interfere with the operation and maintenance of the schools.

Also involved in the whole question is the established fact that when State and local agencies are spending their own money they are more careful to avoid extravagance than when they are spending everybody's money. That is obvious.

Secretary Folsom takes great pains also—both in his statement before the House committee considering the subject, and in his letter to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States—to claim that while the Federal Government for some years has been giving hundreds of millions for the construction and maintenance of schools in areas overburdened because of Federal defense installations and other Federal activities, it has not exercised any control over the expenditures of those funds.

According to the revelations to the House by a very useful Member, Congressman FRANK T. Bow, of Ohio, somebody ought to be supervising such gifts because of evidence of wanton extravagance. The Congressman's interest was aroused because of the refusal of the school board of Arlington County, Va., to make public the details of its budget for 1957–58.

It appears that because of the great Federal burden on Arlington County, the Federal Government paid about 10 percent of the costs of the schools there, both for maintenance and construction.

Upon investigation, Congressman Bow turned up some very interesting items. There is in the budget, he says, \$6,000 to pay expenses of employees to conventions and for training courses at schools. Those attending these conventions, whose expenses the Nation's taxpayers are thus paying, then pass ringing resolutions in favor of Federal aid.

Of course, there are many items in school maintenance and construction other than the classrooms that the President and the Secretary are talking about so much. There are incidentals such as school bands. There are requested in Arlington "several sousaphones at costs ranging from \$700 to \$850,"

and also a harp at \$1,500, and 4 pianos at \$500 each. The children of the Federal bureaucrats living in Arlington will thus be amply supplied the means if not the reality of music.

But the abuse of those musical instruments must be something frightful. For there is an item of \$1,900 for piano tuning. Congressman Bow found that a good piano tuning job can be done for a non-Government-owned piano for \$8.50. Thus there must be 224 pianos already in Arlington in 44 schools. Strange that they should need any more—that is, pianos.

A ping-pong table is needed at \$50. This seems high. There are also items of furniture for tearooms in some schools. Children, according to Secretary Folsom, are crowded in unfit, insanitary schools, but teachers must have their tea, perhaps so that they can best stand the horrible sight of crowded children.

This delineation of what a school seems to need these days makes it clear that Federal aid is not merely to provide good, comfortable rooms and desks and blackboards where children may learn the three R's. There must be fringe benefits. Or are they benefits?

Water Diversion and the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1957

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2 and companion bills, if enacted, would permit diversion of great amounts of additional water from the Great Lakes at Chicago. Recently I registered with the Public Works Committee of the House my vigorous objection to such proposed legislation.

While I am concerned with the protection of valuable and vested property rights belonging to thousands of Lake Michigan real-estate owners in my district, I would like also to focus the attention of Congress upon the tremendous stake and interest which the Federal Government, as a whole, and all the taxpayers of the Nation, have in this matter. The protection of a huge Federal investment should certainly be important in these days when the Members, as well as their constituents, are economy conscious.

To date, Congress has already authorized \$105 million toward this country's share of developing the St. Lawrence seaway.

A bill has been introduced in the House in this session seeking authorization of an additional \$35 million, which will make the total cost of this vast project \$140 million.

The purpose of the St. Lawrence seaway development, of course, is to enable deeper draft oceangoing vessels to use the Great Lake ports.

The legislation proposed to divert Great Lakes water is working directly contrary to, and at cross-purposes with, the seaway project.

Cargo ships presently are operating within an inch of the bottom of the Great Lakes in some areas. The evidence is clear that even a so-called tem-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 1, 1957
For actions of March 29, 1957
85th-1st, No. 55

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7,26	Food distribution.....24	Public Law 480.....12,25
Appropriations.....1	Foreign aid.....3	Reclamation.....22,33
Assistant Secretary.....19	Forestry.....10,34	Research.....20,42
Auditorium.....23	Insect control.....9	stations.....10,21
Budget.....1,25,30	Lands.....6,10	Rural libraries.....1,29
Columbia River.....14	Legislative program.6,25	School lunch.....43
Conservation.....16	Livestock.....37	Small business.....41
Corn.....13	Management.....5	Stockpiling.....32
Cotton.....8	Natural resources.....4	Surplus commodities.....12
Depressed areas.....11	Organization.....5	Taxation.....35
Drought areas.....22	Personnel.....20	Textiles.....39
Education.....1,38	Plant pests.....9	Trade, foreign.....12
Electrification.....33	Postal rates.....18	Transportation.....35
Federal aid.....27	Poultry.....37,40	Water, rights.....15
Flood control.....17	Price supports.....8	research.....28
Flood insurance.....36	Property.....21,35	Wheat.....2,31

HIGHLIGHTS: (See page 6).

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 4203-22). Rejected, 71 to 94, an amendment by Rep. Hiestand to reduce from \$5,000,000 to \$3,000,000 funds for grants to States for rural library services (pp. 4210-22). On a point of order language was stricken from the bill to permit unused allotments to States for vocational education to be reapportioned among other States (pp. 4209-10).

The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H.R. 6500, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1958 (H. Rept. 288). p. 4203

Rep. Brownson discussed the results of a newspaper poll relative to where cuts should be made in the budget. pp. 4223-24

2. WHEAT. Rep. McGovern urged the President to sign H.R. 323, to continue increased allotments for durum wheat, "in spite of reports that the Department of Agriculture is opposed to the bill." pp. 4202-03

3. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Sadlak spoke in favor of economic aid to Poland without further delay. p. 4203

4. NATURAL RESOURCES. Received a Utah Legislature memorial urging the President and Congress to assert their constitutional authority in the conservation and development of land and water resources. p. 4229
5. ORGANIZATION; MANAGEMENT. Received an Ind. Kiwanis Club petition in support of congressional consideration of the report of the Second Hoover Commission. p. 4229
6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the Consent Calendar will be called today and that the military land withdrawals bill will be considered later in the week. pp. 4222-23
7. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 1. p. 4228

SENATE

8. COTTON. Passed without amendment, S. 812, to freeze price supports for extra-long staple cotton at 75% of parity. Sen. Ellender explained the purpose of the bill and inserted Secretary Benson's report of Mar. 15 in support of the bill. pp. 4251-2
9. INSECT CONTROL. Passed without amendment S. 1442, to amend the 1944 Organic Act to include new plant pests. Sen. Ellender inserted Dr. Clarkson's statement before the committee in support of the bill. pp. 4252-3
10. FORESTS. Passed as reported S. 44, to authorize the exchange of certain lands in the Apache National Forest, with payment to the Government for excess values. Sen. Ellender inserted Under Secretary Morse's report of Mar. 14 in support of the bill. pp. 4253-4
Sen. Morse questioned whether S. 1529, to authorize the transfer of an agricultural research station operated under lease from the Bureau of Reclamation, and engaged in the growth of forests on desert land, met the "Morse formula" of payment of 50% of the market value for property conveyed from the United States. p. 4295
11. AREA DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Revercomb spoke in favor of S. 1433, the area assistance bill to encourage new industries in areas of unemployment, and inserted a statement favoring such programs. pp. 4261-2
12. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Sen. Humphrey urged quick passage of S. 1314, to extend Public Law 480. He pointed to the value of the export market, especially to certain products, and the importance of the program in our foreign policy. Sen. Long urged appointment of an expediter to aid in execution of the program. Sen. Humphrey agreed and urged greater use of private traders under the program. He inserted correspondence between himself and the Department of State, and this Department, on the sale of surplus rice. Sen. Schoeppel pointed to "the shortcomings of the executive departments in the administration of the act concerning the refusal by our government to take valuable material in return for some of our surplus commodities." (pp. 4268-9). Sen. Humphrey agreed and inserted an article, by Chester Bowles, on the place of Poland, and two other articles on Poland's negotiations with the United States for agricultural products. He urged a sharing of our food abundance to strengthen the Polish movement toward freedom and independence, and inserted an editorial favoring prompt and adequate help for Poland. Sen. Long urged greater attention to obtaining an "honest exchange of currencies" in our sale of food abroad, and greater attention to possible abuses in the sale of goods in foreign countries. (p. 4272). pp. 4262-72

expense of the taxpayer. Under this bill, farmers would be using a portion if not all of their diverted acres up to a maximum of 60 acres for durum wheat instead of for barley and flax that would doubtless find its way into the bins of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I strongly urge in the interest of a more stable agriculture and in the interest of economy, that the administration sign this measure that has won the approval of both the House and the Senate.

ECONOMIC AID TO POLAND

(Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I am seriously concerned over the delay in reaching some conclusive understanding on Poland's request for economic aid.

Negotiations between the representatives of Poland and our State Department have apparently bogged down almost to a standstill at a time when Poland desperately pleads for help. She needs medicines. She needs food. She needs immediate financial assistance if she is to succeed in keeping the costly gains that she has made in her fight for freedom.

There is no doubt in my mind that if Poland is to be helped at all, she should receive the help when it is most needed and when it could be used to best advantage.

I read with great interest the editorial which appeared today in the Washington Post, commenting on the seriousness of the situation, and it was my intention to insert the article entitled "The Price of Too Little," with these remarks. However, my colleague and friend, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. GORDON of Illinois, had been recognized by the Speaker while I sought recognition for the same purpose at the same time, and I therefore agree with the insertion of the article and urge its reading by all Members of the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. RABAUT, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues against said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 288), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LAIRD reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Alger	Fountain	Magnuson
Anderson,	Frelinghuysen	Mahon
Mont.	Fulton	May
Andresen,	Green, Pa.	Morano
August H.	Gregory	Morrison
Anfuso	Gwinn	Philbin
Aspinall	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Bass, N. H.	Healey	Powell
Bentley	Henderson	Prouty
Bowler	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Hillings	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bray	Holifield	Riehlman
Burleson	Holtzman	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Ikard	Roberts
Carrigg	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	James	St. George
Coad	Johnson, Wis.	Scherer
Collier	Jones, Mo.	Seely-Brown
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sieminski
Dawson, Ill.	Kitchin	Vorys
Dies	Kluczynski	Williams, Miss.
Diggs	Lennon	Williams, N. Y.
Dollinger	McCarthy	Wright
Fascell	McConnell	Zelenko
Fino	Machrowicz	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 7, page 13, of the bill. If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Ways and Means which had the responsibility for writing the fiscal provisions of the Highway Act of last year I think I would be neglecting my duty to the Members of this great body if I did not call their attention to a provision in this bill which has now come to my attention. I rise to challenge that part of the pending bill which would provide funds for salaries and expenses for the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor. Specifically, I refer to lines 9, 10, 11, and 12 on page 3

of the pending bill, which would provide \$365,000 or one-sixth of the total funds covered by the bill for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor.

If you will refer to page 3 of the bill now before us you will find under the heading "Salaries and expenses" the following:

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$2,225,000, together with not to exceed \$365,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this completely and totally violates every concept of the highway trust fund. The highway trust fund was created by this body in order to assure the motoring public of our country that the billions of dollars collected from highway users would be devoted to the purpose of constructing highways.

As a matter of fact, we had heard for many years, particularly those of us who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means, complaint after complaint after complaint about the diversion of funds collected from highway users, to other purposes. So in order to assure the tax-paying motoring public that we would build highways out of the funds derived from the taxes that they paid to use those highways, we created a trust fund. We set it up with a group of trustees. We specifically dedicated a certain group of taxes for that fund. The law creating that trust fund is very specific and, if I may take a minute, I should like to read from the basic act creating the highway trust fund.

Section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 established and provides for the highway trust fund. Section 209 (f) provides for the expenditures which can be made from the trust fund in the following language here pertinent:

(f) Expenditures from trust fund:

(1) Federal-aid highway program: Amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations).

The Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee report:

Both the report of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee contain the following language under subsection (f):

"SUBSEC. (f). Subsection (f) relates to expenditures which may be made from the trust fund. Paragraph (1) provides that amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures during the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1972, inclusive, to meet those obligations of the United States incurred, either before or after the effective date of the bill, under the Federal-Aid Road Act which are attributable to Federal-aid highways. The expenditures referred to are those which normally have been paid out of the appropriation entitled 'Federal-Aid

Highways, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce."

The only agency in the entire Federal system which is mentioned specifically for administrative purposes in connection with the trust fund is the Bureau of Public Roads, and properly so; but in order that there might not be any conceivable mistake about this language we went further. We spelled out in the report that the Bureau of Public Roads was the only agency eligible for the use of these trust funds.

I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means which was charged with the duty of reporting to the Committee on Ways and Means recommendations for the implementation of the President's highway program. I know that the members of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the Senate Finance Committee thought that we were providing for the levying of taxes for the construction of roads and not to provide funds for the general administrative expenses of every agency of the Federal Government. This is made plain by the language contained in the committee reports of both the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, wherein we stated the expenditures referred to are those which normally have been paid out of the appropriations entitled "Federal-Aid Highways, Bureau of Public Roads, Commerce." By this language I think we of the committees involved and of the Congress defined specifically what type of expenditures we thought should be appropriated for out of the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

I can only suppose that the \$365,000 in issue is intended to be used for the purpose of implementing the Davis-Bacon Act as it applies to the Federal highway program. But let me remind you that the Davis-Bacon Act was enacted into law in the early 1930's. Since that time we in this Congress have provided that its provisions were to apply to many projects, yet never have we provided that the funds necessary for administering this Davis-Bacon Act with respect to specific projects were to be provided out of any other fund than the appropriation of the Department of Labor itself. Why now can it be thought that the Congress intended to make taxes levied for the purpose of building roads available to the Department of Labor for the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act?

I tell the Members of the House that we have here a precedent which, if we are not careful, will open up the highway trust fund to every agency of the Government which can conservatively make the assertion that it has some function to perform incidental to the construction of roads. If we are not careful we will place ourselves in a position where the bulk of the trust fund will be utilized for other purposes than for the construction of roads.

Let me make this point. Amounts appropriated from the highway trust fund do not appear in the President's budget. They are amounts set aside, apart from the usual departmental appropriations and requests. By permit-

ting the fund to be utilized for purposes such as contemplated in the pending bill, are we not letting control over the Federal budget slip further and further away from us? I submit that we in the Congress have a duty to the American people to see that the trust fund remains intact—that the taxes which we levied for the purpose of constructing roads will remain available for that purpose. The taxes which we in the Congress provided should be paid into the trust fund are benefit taxes that are levied upon products directly connected with the use of the Federal highways. They should be spent for the purpose of constructing roads.

Let us see what we are doing here. The Department of Labor says they need \$365,000 out of the trust fund to administer the Davis-Bacon provisions in the Highway Act. The Solicitor for the Department of Labor submitted a memorandum to the Committee on Appropriations, a memorandum of law a copy of which I will make a part of the RECORD. That memorandum of law makes no reference whatsoever to the basic legislation, namely, the Highway Act of 1956. It notes the fact that the only specific agency of the Government authorized to receive these appropriations is the Bureau of Public Roads. It says that the power is implied; as a matter of fact, from the report which I have read and from the law which I have read the power is not only not implied but it is specifically prohibited to this Department or any other department of the Government.

Let us see what happens if we do this. I have no complaint about the fact that the Department of Labor may conceivably need more funds to administer these provisions. I have no complaint about the provisions. But if the Department of Labor is able to come in and take \$365,000 out of this fund, then by the same token the Treasury Department ought to be able to come in and take seven or eight or nine or ten million dollars for the cost of collecting these taxes. The Department of Defense, which has worked in close collaboration with the Bureau of Public Roads, should have some authority for its out-of-pocket expenditures. The Department of Justice in the event of lawsuits could very well say, "Well, now, we are entitled to compensation out of the highway trust fund." And so you would go on ad infinitum into every agency of this Government, and sooner or later you would ultimately destroy the concept of the Highway Trust Fund and you would be doing something which is completely and entirely contrary to what this Congress intended when it passed that Act last year.

Referring to this item of \$365,000, I would like to point out beginning with the start of the Federal highway program. The Department of Labor has made 439 unduplicated determinations under section 115 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. This is a small percentage of the total number of determinations made by the Department in carrying out its functioning under all Davis-Bacon provisions for the comparable period. The Department made 164

modifications of existing determinations in connection with the highway program. Compare the appropriation of \$300,000 out of the trust fund made in the Supplemental Appropriation bill of last summer for the Department of Labor, Office of the Solicitor, with the \$184,500 appropriation for all legal expenses for the Department of Public Roads, the agency charged primarily with planning, letting contracts, constructing and supervising the Federal highway system. Approximately 14,500 determinations were made by the Labor Department from the beginning of the fiscal year 1957 to date in connection with the Davis-Bacon Act. Thus, the Federal highway determinations under Davis-Bacon constituted only about 5 percent of the total determinations made. Nevertheless, the \$365,000 which would be provided by this bill constitutes more than 17 percent of the total funds provided by the bill for the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor.

Incidentally this one phase of the Davis-Bacon operation amounts to about one-sixth of the entire appropriation for the solicitor's office in the Department of Labor. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question about this item. Is that \$365,000 charged to the budget estimates submitted by the President?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; it is not included in the total since it is out of a trust fund.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, now, do you see the significance of that my colleagues. You can come in and by this sort of action obtain funds out of the highway trust fund. They are not even accountable on the estimates submitted by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget because this is a separate item just as the social-security trust fund is a separate item. If the Department of Labor can come in and get \$365,000 from this fund and other departments can come in and make the same kind of case, and I firmly believe that some of them can make a much stronger case than the Department of Labor can, for instance, the Treasury Department which collects all these taxes, then they have a very convenient device not only for obtaining funds where they should not be obtaining them, but also circumventing the budget estimates submitted to the Congress. I see my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] on his feet. The gentleman wrote the fundamental provisions of this act. Does the gentleman want me to yield?

Mr. FALLON. Yes. I was going to ask for time to propound a question of the gentleman, but I will ask it now. Do you know of any other construction fund such as the hospital construction fund and the airport construction fund?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Does the gentleman know of any other construction fund where any bills are paid out of the funds of two other agencies for the work that they might do, that is connected with construction, such as the building of hospitals and the civil works programs as contracted for by the Army engineers, or Federal aid to airports, and all of them come within the Davis-Bacon Act. As I say, does the gentleman know whether any money was taken out of the construction fund to pay for the enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act?

Mr. BOGGS. No, quite the contrary. There is no such provision. In addition to that, with reference to all these other items of which the gentleman speaks, you do not have the rather sacred situation that these funds are in, because these funds are separated into a trust fund, and it was done that way specifically so that this very thing could not happen. So far as I know there is positively no precedent for it.

Mr. FALLON. Did we not in all of our hearings before your committee and our committee promise the people who are the users of these highways and who are going to pay these taxes that every dollar would be used for construction?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, we did. That was one of the principal arguments for the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. FALLON. And did we not hit the States at the same time in the hearings for diverting money that was collected from the highway users and using the money in other departments of the State, and do we not have in the law now a provision that we can penalize any State that might divert money which was collected for highway construction purposes?

Mr. BOGGS. We certainly have. You wrote a specific penalty in the law. You wrote a specific prohibition against the diversion of these funds.

Mr. FALLON. And that is to the effect that we would penalize a State that had diverted funds.

Mr. BOGGS. Exactly.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I realize that the gentleman has answered this question, but I would like to get a clearer answer. With reference to this \$365,000 does that go into the total amount of the requested budget or is it outside of that?

Mr. BOGGS. It is outside of it. It is \$2,225,000 plus \$365,000 in question.

Mr. HALEY. So by this device, if the Congress lets it stand, any department that is in existence could come in here and divert that fund without even putting it into the total amount of the budget.

Mr. BOGGS. Let me give you an example in dollars and cents. Let us just say that a department comes in and submits a budget request for \$10 million. They can get the \$10 million plus X number of dollars from the highway trust fund which would never show in the \$10 million.

Mr. HALEY. And there is no way the Congress can make them accountable to

the Congress for that money. Is that right?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield, I was listening when the gentleman asked the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not this was included in the budget estimate. I did not get the chairman's answer, and I do not know whether the RECORD will disclose his answer. What does the gentleman understand his answer to be?

Mr. BOGGS. My recollection is that the chairman said no, it was not included.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is that the answer of the subcommittee?

Mr. BOGGS. That is my recollection of his answer. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee will make it clear?

Mr. FOGARTY. What is that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Was this within the budget estimate?

Mr. FOGARTY. When I was asked that question I said "No." If I can be any clearer than that I do not know how.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is clear now. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Would the gentleman have any objection to going back and having this stricken out of the bill?

Mr. BOGGS. That is what I hope we can do, and I would hope that the chairman of the subcommittee would give his consent.

Mr. FOGARTY. I can answer the gentleman now: You are hoping in vain.

Mr. BOGGS. I am not surprised. I can say to the gentleman that it is my intention to alert the other body as to what is going on here, and I think this will come out of this bill.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, is it not a fact that this requirement of \$365,000 would not exist except for the highway-construction program?

Mr. BOGGS. In the first place I doubt seriously if \$365,000 should be required to publish wage scales that are known to everybody.

In the second place, the same argument can be made toward every other department of Government. That is no reason to violate the law.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the memorandum relied upon by the subcommittee to support the item in question:

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

A question has been raised as to whether appropriations for carrying out the Secretary of Labor's functions under section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 may be charged to the Highway Trust Fund created pursuant to section 209 of the act.

A study and analysis of the legal problems raised by this question indicate that appropriations for carrying out the Secretary's functions can be charged to the trust fund. This conclusion is based on the following considerations:

1. Section 209 (f) (1) of the act provides that amounts in the fund shall be available for making expenditures to meet those obligations incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act, as amended and supplemented, "which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations)."

Clearly, the expense of issuing prevailing wage determinations under the Davis-Bacon Act for work performed on the Interstate System is attributable to Federal-aid highway. The Comptroller General has held (29 Comp. Gen. 507) that where an appropriation is made for a particular object, "by implication it confers authority to incur expenses necessary or incident to proper execution of object." To the same effect, see volume 30, Decisions of the Comptroller General, page 205.¹

2. The act specifically refers to general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such [Federal-Aid Road Act] appropriations, as being included in those expenses which may be chargeable to the fund. The Department of Commerce Appropriation Act for fiscal 1956 contains little information with respect to this matter. It merely refers to general administrative expenses as necessary expenses of administration. Likewise, neither the House nor Senate Appropriation Subcommittee report goes into this question in any detail. However, the hearings of the House subcommittee contains a breakdown on the estimated administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads for fiscal 1956 showing that it covers personal services (1,925 positions), travel, transportation, communication, rents, printing and reproduction, supplies and materials, equipment, grants, and taxes. All of these estimated expenses dealt with the Federal-aid highway program.

It is thus apparent that when Congress, in enacting the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 referred to general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads which might be chargeable to the trust fund it was aware of the fact that these expenses were numerous and varied. It can be reasonably and logically assumed that it intended a broad use of the fund for other purposes, including those relating to the determination of prevailing wages under the Davis-Bacon Act. This conclusion is further supported by the language in section 209 (g) regarding expenditures which will be required "as a result of" the apportionment to the States of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the construction of highways.

3. Other sections of the act expressly authorizing the appropriation of funds for specific purposes to carry out the provisions of the act do not in terms refer to appropriations for the purpose of predetermining prevailing wage rates under the Davis-Bacon Act. It would appear, therefore, that Congress intended that appropriations for this function were impliedly authorized from the Highway Trust Fund.

With respect to the general authority to charge appropriations to special funds, it should be noted that the second supplemental appropriation bill of the Department for the present year appropriates from the Unemployment Compensation Fund for Veterans funds for the payment of salaries and expenses of every bureau in the Department.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we return to page 3, lines 9 to 12, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

¹ In conducting research in connection with the preparation of this memorandum, the decisions of the Comptroller General from 1926 to the present date were searched. In addition, the Office of the Comptroller General was contacted to obtain information with respect to any pertinent unpublished decisions. Due to time limitations, however, the decisions of the Comptroller General prior to 1926 were not checked.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Louisiana just made a very fine speech and I think he deserves a lot of credit for getting the highway construction bill enacted into law. I remember his remarks on the bill and his leadership in getting that bill enacted into law.

We had no reason to think there was any question of the basic authorization for this appropriation. We had a ruling from the Solicitor's Office that it was part and parcel of the highway construction program and that there was authority to appropriate from the fund. This is the first time anyone has questioned that.

This is not anything new as far as paying administrative costs out of trust funds is concerned. All the way through our bill we have done so for years. If you will look at our report in the last pages you will see where we have allowed the Social Security Administrator \$240,000 out of the OASI trust fund for the salaries and expenses of his office. In the Office of the Secretary we have allowed \$260,000 in salaries and expenses out of the OASI trust fund. In the Office of Field Administration we have allowed \$700,000 out of OASI trust fund. In the Office of the General Counsel we have allowed \$425,000 out of the OASI trust fund for the administration of this program.

Then, getting back to the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana regarding the payment of administrative expenses out of the highway trust fund, you will have following this bill in the next week or two in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill an item of about \$16 million out of this same trust fund for administrative expenses of that Department. To me that is just about the same. You have to use about the same reasoning. You have \$18 million for the Department of Commerce that you are taking out of the trust fund for the administration of this program. When you wrote in by a majority vote on the floor of this House that the Davis-Bacon provisions would apply to the highway program, I think that makes it part and parcel of the overall program. I think that we had a perfect right to expect that that would be enforced and, since it is part and parcel of the overall program, I do not see why it should not be financed like the rest of the administrative expenses.

May I give one more example of construction? The gentleman from Maryland asked the question if this type of financing appeared in any other construction program. It does in the school-construction program for federally impacted areas. We took out of that fund \$800,000 plus this year for the Housing and Home Finance Agency for supervision of the construction of these school buildings. That is a pretty good example. Now, if I can give you 1 or 2 other

examples. The Solicitor's Office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare gets an annual authorization to use funds from the food and drug trust fund and has for many years. The whole administrative expense of the Bureau of Employment Security, and even the cost of collection of this tax is taken from the unemployment compensation fund. The gentleman said the Treasury Department could make an excellent case with regard to the highway trust fund. It may be a better case to get the administrative costs of collecting these taxes out of the trust fund than out of the general funds of the Treasury. I think maybe they should. It would save the Federal Government some money because the whole administrative expense of the Bureau of Employment Security, and even the collection costs of the Treasury Department, are paid out of that special unemployment compensation fund which is put up by the employers of the country.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman referred to the Social Security Board which by law is authorized to administer the Social Security Act. The gentleman referred to the Bureau of Public Roads when that appropriation will come before us. The Bureau of Public Roads is specifically authorized in the act to receive funds for administering this law out of the trust fund. The very terms of the act prohibit any other agency from getting these funds. The memorandums submitted by the Solicitor of the Department of Labor, I submit, is weak and it makes no valid case for this appropriation. It ignores the basic act, the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, and the legislative history of H. R. 10660 in the 84th Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY), he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FOGARTY. That still does not answer the question. I am not here as a lawyer. I am not a good judge as far as points of order or anything of that kind are concerned. The only thing I am trying to do is to clear up a little bit the situation, if I can. Maybe I cannot. I am just giving you the advice that was given to us in these hearings when we discussed this part of the bill.

Let me say further to the gentleman from Louisiana this is not the first time that this has appeared in an appropriation bill. I think in a supplemental appropriation bill last year, immediately after the passage of this highway bill, there was an item of \$300,000 for the same purpose. It passed both Houses and there were not any objections raised at that time. So, as a consequence, we did not again raise the question of legality because we had every reason to think it had been settled to everyone's satisfaction. The memorandums of law that we received from the Solicitor last year seemed pretty definite. May I read the No. 1 section that he gave to us?

He said:

Section 209 (f) (1) of the act provides that amounts in the fund shall be available for making expenditures to meet those obligations incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act as amended and supplemented which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable by such appropriations).

With that kind of wording in the memorandum given to us by the Solicitor we thought, of course, they could be taken out of the trust fund.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman read a moment ago the very language that is in the bill which limits these items to the Bureau of Public Roads. I have no complaint about the Davis-Bacon provision. I realize that they are entitled to funds for their administration, but they are not entitled to come in here and get them. This was a trust fund, and by the same token, the Treasury Department, which has the responsibility of collecting all these taxes—and it is a grave responsibility—would be entitled to millions of dollars.

Mr. FOGARTY. Maybe they should get it. Maybe the expenses of collecting those taxes should come out of this highway fund.

Mr. BOGGS. But this is still a government of laws.

Mr. FOGARTY. Certainly.

Mr. BOGGS. I hope it is. And this circumvents the law pure and simple.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is your word against the solicitor's. I do not know who is right. I presume the gentleman is a lawyer.

Mr. BOGGS. I am, sir.

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, it is one lawyer against another. I am not. I am in the middle here.

Mr. BOGGS. We of the Committee on Ways and Means would have been glad to supply assistance. They were looking for an easy touch here and found it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am in the middle here. The Solicitor of the Department of Labor says clearly that the expense under the Davis-Bacon work performed on the Interstate System is "attributable to Federal-aid highways."

Mr. BOGGS. As a matter of fact, the solicitor asked for it last year when it got over to the Senate. That is how this business got in there. He asked for \$1 million; can you believe it, he said he needed \$1 million to administer this provision, and the committee gave him \$500,000. Then it came back over here in conference, and you gentlemen cut it down to \$300,000.

It should not be the responsibility of those who have to write the basic laws to check on the Committee on Appropriations. We expect you to follow the law.

Mr. FOGARTY. In the first place, they requested \$500,000 in the supplemental last year which went to the other body where it was cut to \$300,000 and we agreed to that figure in conference.

Now, with regard to following the law, we are following the law as interpreted by those who are supposed to know what is in the law.

Mr. BOGGS. If you want to, we will give you a chance to correct it here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I demand the regular order. The Committee is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The point of order is that we are not discussing the bill. There is a unanimous-consent request pending, and the regular order is, as I understand, that we proceed to read the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that as soon as this bill becomes law, the one that we have before us, that that supersedes any provision that might be in the other bill? It supersedes the highway construction law. The last law is the one that governs.

Mr. BOGGS. If that is true, the gentleman is admitting that you are legislating in an appropriation bill, which is in direct violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman is correct in his opinion as against the Solicitor's.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman knows that it is against the rule to legislate in the Committee on Appropriations, but you do it all the time. I agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman. I demand the regular order.

The Clerk read as follows:

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$3 million: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time very briefly to give a report to the membership as to House action to date on the budget which was submitted to us by the President of the United States.

In the last few days we have had a number of comments on the floor that we should follow our leader; that we should support the budget for these two departments in its entirety; that we should not cut any items in this bill. Now, this is what has happened to date with the President's budget requests.

The Treasury and Post Office bill went through the House, and it was reduced under the budget \$80,364,000, a reduction of 2 percent. The Department of Interior bill went through the House—and all of these bills passed without objection from either side—and was reduced \$60,794,000, a reduction of 11.8 percent.

General governmental matters bill went through with a reduction of \$4,900,500, or 23.4 percent under the budget estimate.

The independent offices bill was reduced by the House \$537,993,300 under the budget estimate, a reduction of 9 percent.

The bill we now have before us reduced the budget estimate \$118,774,700, a reduction of 4 percent, as reported to the House by the committee.

If we take all those figures and do not add any of the cuts which have been made in this bill now pending before us, as of this date we have reduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States the President's budget for the fiscal year 1958 by \$802,826,500, or an overall reduction of 6 percent. And we have not gotten into the big spending bills yet.

I think that the House of Representatives is making a very splendid record. I hope that we can continue that record. This bill before us has been cut far less than most of the bills which have gone through the House of Representatives.

Personally I see nothing sacred in the President's budget. I think it is up to him only to suggest to the Congress of the United States how we should spend the people's money. I am happy to accept the responsibility which I feel is mine, a responsibility which is on each Member, to act on this budget as we see fit. I do not think there should be anything sacred about this bill or any other bill. It is our responsibility as representatives of the people of the United States to determine how their money should be spent. I think we have made a very excellent record to date in cutting the budget by \$802,826,500 and I hope that we shall continue cutting so that we may restore a little bit of sanity to the fiscal policy of the United States Government.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Two hundred and seven million dollars was cut from the Veterans' Administration insurance and

compensation payments; \$76 million was cut from old-age assistance grants. Does the gentleman believe that they were real or paper cuts? That is a total of \$276 million out of the \$802 million the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. BUDGE. I think there are a number of paper cuts, and they are frequently referred to here on the floor as phony cuts. In this particular bill as reported to the House, there is \$99 million of a claimed \$118 million saving that is also in that category. But I do know that the action which the House has taken here in the last 3 days in most instances was aimed at making actual and not phony reductions.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to disagree with the amounts mentioned by my friend from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] but once again I wish you would listen to this. As far as this committee is concerned we cut this budget overall by about 4 percent, from a total of over \$2,900,000,000.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me on that specific point?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. Is it not true that \$99 million of the \$118 million reduction the gentleman claims in this bill is in the category mentioned by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. But we think that that reduction will stand up. For instance, we made the reduction of \$79 million in public assistance, because the President asked for \$2,500,000 to train personnel in the public-assistance field and he requested in this budget \$2,080,000 for a cooperative research program in the field of public assistance, both of which we thought would tend to reduce the public-assistance load. And we had reason to believe the amendments to the Social Security Act that most of us voted for a year ago, the liberalization of that act, we had reason to believe that would reduce the number of people on public assistance. As I said before, if we get into a recession or a depression in the next year, then we will have to come back with a supplemental appropriation. If more men and women are on public-assistance rolls, we will have to come back and match those grants the States have because that is on a strictly matching basis laid down by law and there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. A year ago we made a similar cut in the public-assistance program. I cannot remember the figures, but that would have carried them if it had not been for the additional legislation which raised the rate.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct. When the Social Security Act was liberalized back in 1948 or 1949, I have forgotten which year, we reduced the public-assistance grants at that time by \$50 million. We thought we might have been going too far. The Senate at that time reduced it an additional \$100 mil-

lion, which made the total reduction \$150 million, and it turned out that that was all they needed. So we have every reason in the world to believe it may stand; but maybe it will not, under the conditions I have given you.

The thing that makes these departments difficult to cut, and the President himself has used these figures, is that 91 percent of this appropriation for the Department of Labor is in the area of grant-in-aid programs, like grants to States for unemployment compensation, which is not anything out of the Federal Treasury at all. So when you cut that appropriation by \$12 million—some-odd-thousand the other day you were not decreasing the Federal outlay in this program one dime, not a nickel. And when you passed the amendment taking away \$1,500,000 for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, you were not cutting a dime that would come from the general funds of the Treasury.

So, as I said yesterday, after 3 days on the Department of Labor appropriation, you say that you cut \$15 million. You actually, as far as the Treasury is concerned, cut only about \$1,300,000, and let us make no mistake about it.

The point I did want to make is that in the Department of Labor 91 percent of these appropriations are State-aid programs, and the majority of it is unemployment compensation, that fund which has been paid into by the employers of this country.

The other big one is unemployment compensation for veterans and unemployment compensation for Federal employees, and the employees' compensation fund.

So we had an area of only 9 percent to operate in in the Department of Labor.

In the Health, Education, and Welfare field, where we are now, 91 percent of this \$2½-billion figure is tied down by legislation, by commitments we have made to the people. \$1,600 million is for public assistance, and I do not believe anybody is going to cut that any further than we have. We cannot do anything about that. In addition, 7.5 percent is for expenditures in the field of public health. I do not think you want to cut public health. So that leaves us in this \$2-billion field an area of 1.5 percent to cut. Does the gentleman disagree with me on those figures?

Mr. BUDGE. I disagree with the gentleman. I think the figures show that approximately 64 percent of this bill would be in the category to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; it is 91 percent.

Mr. BUDGE. That is the figure given to me by the committee staff.

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, we are talking about two different things. You are including only those items where there is a legal requirement that we appropriate funds. I was including the total of the grant items, all of which are set up by basic legislation passed by Congress and, to my way of thinking, we certainly have a moral obligation to carry out the programs as we told the people we were going to when we passed the legislation.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman keeps making a distinction which I cannot

quite understand. He keeps saying that we are not saving anything because these are funds that belong in a trust fund and they are funds paid in by an employer or an employee or a combination of both. But, we are saving the money—what difference does it make if somebody paid it, into what fund it went? They are all taxpayers and the amounts are in the budget.

Mr. FOGARTY. It does not come out of the Federal Treasury at all. When we speak about reducing the budget we are talking about reducing the budget so far as it affects the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BUDGE. Suppose it is coming out of the Treasury and then going into a different category than what you are talking about.

Mr. FOGARTY. Not any more. The Reed Act changed that a couple of years ago. That is not the same system that we were under at all. Anything that is paid in now over \$200 million, I believe the figure is, goes back to the States, because it does not belong to you and it does not belong to me. It belongs to the people who have paid it in to provide unemployment compensation for these people who are out of work. We only administer the fund. That is the only control we have over it. It is not a drain on the Federal Treasury at all. That is the point I make.

Mr. BUDGE. Let us consider my own State of Idaho as a specific example. The gentleman is talking about the unemployment compensation fund. My State, when I checked some time back, had enough in that fund to operate in depression times for a period of about 19 years, but my State of Idaho cannot get a nickel of the excess it paid in for years.

Mr. FOGARTY. They are getting it now under the Reed Act which you passed a year or two ago. When you arrive at this balance of \$200 million—and that balance has been reached, then all these payments go back to the States and your State too is now receiving payments. The gentleman knows I am right in making that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Federal Treasury was making about \$60 million a year on this fund. That \$60 million is, from now on, going to be distributed back to the States under the provisions of the Reed bill.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, it will be disposed of to the States in the event that sufficient savings are built up to reach the provisions called for in the Reed bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. It has already been built up that far.

Mr. BUDGE. But, regardless of that, I still do not follow the gentleman when he says that these funds do not amount to anything because they are in some

special category. The people pay it into the Treasury—the employers and the employees. Why should we be more reckless with their expenditures than we are with other money? I do not see the distinction.

Mr. FOGARTY. When you voted to cut down this fund, the other day for grants to States for unemployment compensation, you are penalizing those States and at the same time you are not allowing them to do a good job of administration. We found fault with the administration of the program in one of the States a few years ago because of a bad situation regarding fraudulent claims. We gave them more money a couple of years ago to straighten that situation out. When you cut back this amount the day before yesterday, you are inviting the same condition to prevail in other States. I see some Members shaking their heads. But you are doing exactly that. That is what you did when you cut back on this fund. These States want these funds and it belongs to them. It does not belong to you. You did not pay into it and neither did I. I am not contributing to that fund and neither are you. It is the employers of these people who are paying into the fund. The State certainly ought to be given the privilege of administering this fund in a fair and honest manner. That is what you should allow them to do if you want to help the employees.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the gentleman from Rhode Island. When the two gentlemen who are on the subcommittee disagree so drastically as they just have, I wonder if the gentlemen—this bill will not come up as I understand it for final vote on the amendments until Tuesday—would it be possible to give us some kind of a memorandum telling just why when an amendment is offered to cut an item in the bill and adopted and the gentleman opposes the amendment on the ground, he says, that it does not make any real reduction, its adoption does not cut the budget? Why does the gentleman take that position, make that argument? It was may thought that reducing an item in the bill brought about a reduction in the budget.

Mr. FOGARTY. In the first place, I do not know whether we are going to get to vote on this on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the information is sought for tomorrow or before Monday.

Mr. FOGARTY. At the rate we are going now it may be a week from Monday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where the expenditure comes out of a trust fund I can understand that a reduction in an amount carried in the bill does not necessarily reduce a tax, it does nevertheless, reduce the amount carried in the bill.

That is all beside the issue raised now by me.

Mr. FOGARTY. And we may have a week of rollcalls by the time we arrive at that point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand that; I have heard that 4 or 5 times. I have no objection. Care not at all how many rollcalls are demanded.

Mr. FOGARTY. Then everybody will be on notice that we are going to have it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not seeking that information; I am just completely lost as to the gentleman's reasons for posing these amendments, the ones to which the gentleman referred, when adopted—as not reducing the budget.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I said yesterday, I hope to be able just prior to the Committee's rising just after it has finished the bill under the 5-minute rule, to put in a statement with reference to the amendments that have been adopted, what they will do, and also announce to the membership the number of amendments on which we are going to ask a rollcall vote. My friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] yesterday said he was going to insist on a rollcall on every amendment that was adopted, and I agreed that I would cooperate with him on that, because that would be all right with me. Have I answered the gentleman's question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The distinguished gentleman has used many words, but I find no answer to my question in them. My question was this: Several times amendments have been adopted, but the gentleman opposed the adoption of them, and the gentleman—the distinguished gentleman, I will get it right after a while—made the statement that the adoption of a particular amendment did not amount to any reduction in the budget. What I would like to have by Monday morning, if it would not be too much work, is a statement to show why adopting an amendment which strikes a specified amount from the bill does not amount to a reduction in the budget. I am completely confused by the gentleman's assertion. That is said in all sincerity.

Mr. FOGARTY. I will say to the most distinguished gentleman from Michigan—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Thanks for the "most."

Mr. FOGARTY. That on yesterday I did put an analysis into the RECORD of what the cuts in the Labor Department amounted to, what the amendments were, and what it would do to the operations. We have adopted only one other amendment. At the rate we are going today I do not have to do much more than that by Monday to let the gentleman know what else has transpired in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Apparently I have not made my question clear. This is my question: "Will the gentleman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, tell us why when we adopt an amendment which cuts something from the bill, a deferred specified amount, tell us the reason the gentleman has for saying that it does not cut anything from

the budget? That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is a pretty good summary appearing at page 4155 of today's RECORD. I hope I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. With apologies permit me to express the opinion the gentleman has made no answer at all.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry. My time has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me a minute for information?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman. I do not know whether I can furnish him information he seeks or not.

Mr. MASON. Every item in this bill is an item contained in the budget. No matter what fund the item comes from or anything, it is part of the budget. Then when we cut an item out of this bill we certainly are reducing the budget as it was presented to us, because every single item in this bill, whether it refers to a trust fund or an unemployment fund, or some other kind of fund is a part of the budget.

Mr. COLMER. I have been voting along with the gentleman on that theory.

Mr. Chairman, there are times when I am sure that the old adage of remaining quiet and unseen is the best advise. I would like to have your attention here, though, on a matter, and then I want somebody to follow it up, because, frankly, I am not going to do anything about it.

We are now approaching in this economy-minded Committee of the Whole House 2 items of appropriation. On page 14, Freedmen's Hospital calling for an appropriation of some \$3 million, and on page 16, Howard University, calling for an appropriation of \$3,800,000. I repeat, I am not going to do anything about it except just to point it up, but I do want to point it up to those who subscribe to the Supreme Court opinion doing away with segregation in our schools and our school systems and those who are such strong advocates of the civil-rights program.

No. 1: If the opinion of the Supreme Court voiding segregation is sound and you believe in that, then you ought to move to strike these two items. These items are not subject to a point of order and if they were I would not make that point of order and I hope nobody from my section of the country will because those institutions throughout the years since they were established by basic law have served a great purpose in giving physical care to the colored people of this country and in giving them an educational system of higher learning.

I understand that now Howard University is no longer a segregated school. It is an integrated school. If it is, it ought to stand on its own feet and upon its own merit. How many schools and colleges in your States are supported by the Federal Government, whether they be integrated or segregated? The an-

swer, of course, is not one. I am talking now to those who are economy minded, both those of a previous day and those who have gotten economy minded recently in this economy drive.

Does it make sense? I happen to belong to the school of thought that not only believes that these institutions have served their purpose in the past but that there is necessity for them still; therefore, I am not going to offer an amendment to strike them. But those of you who are so busy on the other school of thought, who say that these people have now arrived, who contend that in just a few generations they have become socially and otherwise equal, that they do not need any Federal assistance, then, it seems to me, particularly those of you who are on the economy drive, should move to strike these appropriations. Frankly, if you move to strike them, I am going to vote against you, because, I repeat, I belong to the other school, the one that believes there is still a necessity for this type of assistance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this opportunity to be a little bit realistic and to call the attention of the membership to what the situation really is. This fact should be remembered when some of these liberal sponsored bills come up shortly for consideration on the floor.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 2), and section 202 of said act (70 Stat. 925), section 4 of the act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), the act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31), including \$4 million for extension and improvement of practical nurse training, \$33,442,081: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under section 3 (a), (1), (2), (3), and (4) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$29,267,081 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount of allotment which States and Territories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HIESTAND. I wish to raise the point of order against the proviso on line 14, page 17, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. Coming as it does, it would make a change, you might say, in the formula that has been adopted in the basic act; the formula for the distribution of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no other recourse but to agree that it is subject to a point of order. But, when you do strike this out, you are going to penalize those States who have the best programs for vocational training.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet to make the same point of order against that provision of the bill. I doubt if many Members of the House caught the language of that provision, so I want to, if I may, correct the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee who said it was penalizing some of the States.

Now, what that provision did, as I am afraid many provisions of this bill do, it wanted to make sure that every dollar was appropriated and every dollar was spent, so that if there was anything left over, it was going to be thrown to the birds somewhere or other, and what that provision amounted to was that if in the distribution of those funds there were some States in the Union that did not use up their portion of the funds, other States should be able to get them and spend them so they would be sure there would be nothing left to revert to the Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for library services: For grants to the States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1956, as amended (70 Stat. 293-296, 911), \$5,000,000.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HIESTAND: Page 18, line 3, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed the obligation over the last few days of appropriating whatever has been authorized. I would say the theme of my remarks is that authorizations that we made over the years do not automatically make appropriations; that it is the job of the Committee on Appropriations to look over these authorizations and grant only those funds which can be well spent and should be well spent. History is replete with cases where the Committee on Appropriations has deemed fit, after a period of hearing from the constituency, shall we say, not to appropriate. That is the basis on which I think we are justified in giving this amendment consideration. This is not a large item. It has many friends. It has to do with the libraries.

We voted an authorization a couple of years ago of \$7,500,000. There was appropriated about \$2 million. It could not all be spent. The Department this year asked for \$3 million. There are matching funds, it is true. Actually, they have spent quite a lot less because you cannot get a program of this kind started immediately.

We have received wires, pressure wires from our districts, some sent from central headquarters, although they were supposed to be from various other places.

Mr. Chairman, we can rationalize any one of these measures. We can talk ourselves into them. But we must realize that, although there was only a shade over \$2 million appropriated last year, the Department asked for \$3 million. That is all the Department asked for. We, in our committee, automatically and

spontaneously raised it to \$5 million. I do not know whether it can be used.

I might say this: that on discussing this with several Members on my side of the aisle and perhaps one from the other side—I am not too sure—there was a feeling that this represented Federal aid, Federal grants, and was not justified in the first place, and they would like to strike it entirely. They urged me to change my amendment and to strike it out entirely instead of leaving it at \$3 million. So this figure of \$3 million, in a sense, is a compromise. It is all the Department asked for, and I do not believe we are justified in asking for raising it automatically to \$5 million.

We must remember that on this bill as a whole, with the so-called phony cuts—and we are sincere about this—they may all be filled back in, and they may even be exceeded so that we may be authorizing an expenditure under this bill in excess of the budget authorization. That does not sound much like cutting. What we are trying to do is to get back to the level of last year, to reason. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The basis of the gentleman's argument is simply this, is it not: that one Congress cannot bind another. If one Congress in the past authorized certain things, it does not mean that a following Congress must appropriate money to carry them out. Is that it?

Mr. HIESTAND. The gentleman has expressed it very well. That is the basis for opening a subject. The basis of this amendment is that it gives the Department all they asked for. It is a compromise between those who wish to cut it out entirely and those who are for the amount recommended by the committee. I urge the approval of the amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee is not going to adopt this amendment. On yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made the statement that this was the only item in the bill that was above the budget estimate. I told him it was true that I had sponsored it in the committee, and I was proud of it, and I was proud of it because of the fact it does affect the library-services item.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing sacred about the budget either in the maximum or the minimum. As I said to you on yesterday, I think we ought to approach these things on a reasonable basis. If the budget is wrong at one end it may be wrong at the other. We ought not hesitate to add to it where we think it wise any more than we hesitate to cut it.

You know what this program does. It takes the light of literature and learning to those who sit in darkness in many of our rural areas. I think we ought for a moment to go back and realize that it was only last year that this House passed this bill under the leadership of the gen-

tlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

This is what happened. That was one of the last bills passed during the session. At the suggestion of many of us, the committee asked the Budget Bureau to send up a request for an appropriation. The Budget Bureau requested \$7,500,000, the full amount authorized for the operation of the program the first year. The last supplemental appropriation bill had already left the House, so this request went to the Senate. The Senate allowed the full \$7,500,000. When it came back to the House conference committee, realizing it was late in the session and that probably the full \$7,500,000 could not be used, gave \$2,050,000 for the program for the first year.

This year the Office of Education asked the Budget Bureau for \$5 million, the amount that is included in this bill. The Budget Bureau cut that back to \$3 million. Mr. Folsom when we asked him why he finally accepted that amount instead of the amount he had requested for the second year of this service said, "Well, you folks wouldn't give us but \$2 million last year. I thought you might give us \$3 million this year." Apparently he was a little irked because of the fact that we did not give them all they asked for the first year.

About whether or not there is any need for this money, whether the amount should be increased or be left as it was, I called the Department just yesterday or the day before and asked them to give me the facts about the number of States that had qualified or were expected to qualify for this money during the next fiscal year. First of all, in fiscal 1957, 38 States have already submitted satisfactory plans to the Office of Education for the improvement and extension of the rural library service. State plans from at least two other States are expected before the end of fiscal 1957. This makes a total of 40 of the 48 States which will have taken advantage of the plan in the first year of its operation. To date 29 State plans have been approved by the Office of Education and payments have been made to 28 States. It is expected that at least 38 State plans will be approved before the end of fiscal 1957. Payments to these States based on the minimum appropriation of \$2,050,000 for fiscal 1957 will total \$1,520,000.

With reference to fiscal 1958, the information from the States on their library service plans for fiscal 1958 indicates that 46 States and 2 Territories would submit plans, and based on the maximum authorization of \$7,500,000 could match for \$6,931,445.

I will say that those of us who favor this service and think it ought to be continued and who think that this program which was unanimously—I will not say unanimously but overwhelmingly endorsed last year by the Congress, thought that \$6 million should be the appropriation for this year, but we agreed on \$5 million as a compromise. As you see, that will not quite cover the payments that the States are expecting. Many of the States have only this year passed legislation that makes it possible for

them to go into this service. It was provided that these services should be extended to the Territories also.

Based on a \$5 million appropriation in 1958, the States could match for \$4,689,741.

In view of the need for this program, and the fact that the States are so anxious to match it and to get into this program, one Member on your side told me that his legislature had never taken any action although they had been urged to do it until the Federal Government promised its help and then the State passed its legislation at this year's session. So the States are ready and anxious to supply their part of the funds. I trust that you will defeat the amendment which would reduce it to \$3 million.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my record on economy stacks up as good as anybody's record that I know of in the House. I believe I have a fair record for voting against those things where a "no" vote was normally expected to be political dynamite. I want to say to you I am making these statements in the interest of this money with no fear and expecting no favor, but because I think it is right. If you will just stop and think of the millions and millions of dollars in this bill that relate directly to the urban people, the people in the towns and in the cities and, of course, I have them, and you have them. I want the services, and you want the services. But here is a little bookmobile that goes out into every rural district, the country roads, the highways, and the byways—these bookmobiles carry books to kids and grownups who would never see those books if they were not brought out there to them, as some live 30 miles and more from any kind of library. I am one who views the problems of juvenile delinquency very seriously. But there is no need for us to try to avoid the fact that children today are the same as we were when we were children. We had to be doing something, good or bad. We certainly were not going to just sit around and do nothing. If we can interest these children in books, that, in my opinion, would be a fine thing. I have passed these bookmobiles on the road. Yes, many are worn out, and a lot of them shake and rattle. The books are very, very worn, and many times the supply too low.

This law was passed last year. The States have been doing a fairly good job in this field in a limited way; they have been taking from their own funds, and the counties have contributed, individuals have contributed, and each year it becomes more popular in the States and with the schoolkids in the rural communities. Why, you can go to the city library and get almost any book that you want. In the high schools, in the towns and cities, the teachers can say to a child: "I want you to read such and such reference book." All right, if she did not think that was good for that child she would not recommend it.

A student 30 or 40 miles in the country, has difficulty obtaining reference material; and those available through bookmobiles and county libraries are getting

to a point now that many of the books are out of date, tattered and worn out. So last year we adopted this bill. It went into operation only last fall. I think there is enough fair play in this world for everybody, and I think this is a fine thing for the rural people of this country. Some of those boys and girls in rural communities will move into town, and if agricultural conditions do not get better they will be coming down into the breadlines by the thousands.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If they do move to town they cannot get jobs unless they pay fees to join a union.

Mr. BARDEN. I did not say anything about a job. I said they would be in the breadlines. I do not know about that. This money does not go down to a department to be juggled around and half of it spent for personnel. There are three people, as I understand, in the Department that have been handling this, and I do not expect them to employ anyone else.

Let this money go where it is needed. I do not want so many supervisors supervising the supervisors, and then a superintendent superintending the supervisors. I do not care for that. I want these books to go through the country and I would like them to go to the children. I would like to have them become interested enough in books that they will sit down and read and read; and when somebody comes along and wants to play this or that, they will still be interested in that book; or, if somebody wants them to go somewhere they are still interested in the book; it is new and interesting to them.

I am satisfied with my record on economy and I think it will be all right on the appropriations this year. I do not think there is any other way to stop a raise in taxation or bring about a reduction in expenses except by cautious appropriations or cutting them down. Along with that I think some sound good reasoning should be applied. When we get to an item of this kind let it be appraised: Is it valuable? Is it contributing? Is it putting any information into the hands of people who can use it? Is it putting in motion a program that is going to be worth a lot to this country? Is it a good investment? Is it wise?

I think the past history of this country shows that the rural people have been a pretty substantial people; and, loyal. There is not a group of people on the face of this earth more loyal to this Nation and more patriotic than the rural people; Commies and pinks do not dwell among them, and that the records will disclose through all time. Jefferson was not so far wrong when he said that so long as the balance of power remains in the hands of the rural people democracy will be safe. But I am not so sure that they will be able to defend themselves against the isms and so forth, if one segment of our population is permitted to rise, while the rural people stand stationary intellectually or otherwise.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to disagree with some of my very good friends who have spoken against the pending amendment, but we ought to look the facts definitely in the face. The question on this amendment and on this provision is, Who is responsible for the education of the youth of this land, for the information of the youth of this land? Is it the Federal Government or is it the States? You cannot have your cake and eat it too. You just cannot do that. If it is the States, then let the States do it. The Federal Government has no right to interfere with the States, and there is no stronger advocate of States rights in this House than I am. But here we have it. The States are doing this, but the Federal Government has got to put its nose into it and come along and say: "We want to encourage you States to do these things." After the Federal Government gets its nose into it, under present law the States have to submit a plan for the libraries to be approved by the Federal Government before they can get some of these moneys from the Federal Government. It is either the States' responsibility or it is not. If it is the responsibility of the States I do not see how any person in this House who believed in States rights could have voted to put this thing in the bill last year in the first place and how he can vote against striking the whole thing now.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at her own request) was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I recognize that this appropriation has been raised by the subcommittee beyond the amount called for in the President's budget. However, it has been pointed out convincingly by Members on both sides of the aisle that the President's budget need be no guide to our action today. I feel that we must examine this item on its own merits, which are manifold.

The rural library service program has been in effect less than a year. It was approved last May by a substantial majority in this House. As I remember it, it was a voice vote, no division was asked and there was little opposition to it. Shortly thereafter it was approved by the Senate and it was signed by the President.

The States have been taking action under this enabling legislation ever since it became law. Last year the appropriation was \$2,050,000. It was small. It was actually less than one-third of the authorized item because of the lateness of the passage of the bill. However, \$1,120,000 has already been paid out by the States and by the end of this fiscal year most of the balance will be used.

I wish to emphasize and repeat what this distinguished gentleman from Geor-

gia has said, that in fiscal 1958 and in the remaining years of the 5-year period—fixed by the original legislation—the full authorized amount will be needed and it will be used. The most recent figures indicate that 38 States and Territories have submitted plans to the Department, that 30 of these plans have been approved, and that fiscal approval has been given and payment already started to 28 of the 30. Further information from the Department indicates that 46 States and Territories will be participating in this program by the end of fiscal year 1958. In fact, the needs of the program for 1958, for fiscal 1958, are even in excess of the amount that was reported by the committee. The Department estimates that the States will be prepared to match grants totaling \$6,931,445, while the committee has recommended only \$5 million.

I wish at this point to commend the committee for its foresight and for its vote of confidence in the willingness and the ability of the States to carry out this vital program. The word "distinguished" is perhaps overused in the House, but I do wish to congratulate the truly distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for his understanding and his contribution to this program and the very magnificent job I think he has been doing with this appropriation bill dealing with people's lives, their health, their education, their welfare: the things that in the last analysis either make or break a nation.

Let me describe this library program very briefly. The legislation does not envisage the construction of library buildings, or the purchase of land for such buildings. It does not visualize adding to the already ample library facilities of our great cities, where library services are already available to the people. As the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee has stated, the appropriation before us is a rural library services appropriation, to make available to the people who live on the farms and in the villages and small towns, their fair share of the library resources of the Nation. The original legislation grew out of the realization that millions of Americans—27 million was the figure brought before the committee—are denied access to local public library services. The money we ask for here will go for bookmobiles, for library personnel, for the other library services that must be made available to these 27 million Americans.

I expect to hear, Mr. Chairman, that this is no time for luxuries, for frills. We are not talking here about luxuries or frills. Books, Mr. Chairman, are the building blocks of the future. I think most of the Members here have children. I am sure that most have had the deeply satisfying experience of seeing a child read a book, of watching the sense of wonder grow in that child's eyes, at the new worlds taking shape before him. I am sure there is not a Member on this floor who has not treasured the moment when his or her child first awakens to the understanding and the appreciation of the treasures that lie within the covers of a book. When the authorizing legislation was being debated in this House,

some Member remarked that it was not a case of voting for or against books or children.

Mr. Chairman, I must sincerely disagree. The appropriation is an investment in the spiritual and mental and moral well-being of our children. Without access to the real wealth of a library, too many of our children will fall prey to the gaudy tinsel of the comic book, the lurid pulp magazine. But given this access, the children of this generation can be led to the wisdom, the insight, the truth, that has survived the ages.

Let me say, too, Mr. Chairman, that this is truly a defense appropriation as if it were allocated for guided missiles or battleships. An educated citizen is a Federal responsibility. We cannot hope to maintain the technological ability upon which the Nation's security depends, unless we encourage and enable our children to read, and to read deeply. A library, Mr. Chairman, pays for itself many times. The Russians are proud of their literacy campaigns, and their rural libraries. Surely we, who have at our disposal, the free libraries of a free people can do as much to make those libraries available to those people as do the tyrants who seek only to spoon-feed chained minds with their doctored propaganda.

One final word, Mr. Chairman. Over the entrance to many libraries are graven words from the greatest of all books. These words are, Ye Shall Know the Truth, and the Truth Shall Make You Free. The cost, Mr. Chairman, of giving 27 million Americans access to the truth is \$5 million. Our decision is not as to the cost, but as to the value.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Mrs. KNUTSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by this wonderful lady in regard to the fight for our rural libraries.

Mr. Chairman, as the Congresswoman from Minnesota, I am proud to say that Minnesota was among the first 4 States to develop its plan for the use of funds under the Library Services Act of the 84th Congress, 2d session, Public Law 597, and the first State to receive a check for development of the plan—in our case the maximum possible allocation of \$40,000. The rapidity with which my State worked out and presented its plan for approval is significant in that it is an indication of the great desire and the great need for participation in this extremely valuable program.

It is unthinkable to me that the full amount of the authorization, \$7,500,000 should not be appropriated for this valuable service. The maximum amount as authorized is certainly not excessive. In fact, it could almost be called a pittance in view of the need and value of the program. I cannot understand the President's proposal for an appropriation of a mere \$3 million to cover expenses of this educational assistance program, in view of the administration's avowed espousal of the cause of better educational facilities and collateral educational aids.

May I read to you a few communications from organizations and individuals in my area who are most aware of the great needs this service, adequately financed, will satisfy. These include a telegram from the Minnesota Library Association, one of a number of letters from constituent agencies, and a letter from the Moorhead Public Library, Moorhead, Minn. I would also like to read excerpts from my statement to Chairman CANNON on the rural library services appropriation.

Because the Minnesota plan for the development of rural library services under the Library Services Act is a fine and thoughtful work, I ask permission to place the memorandum outlining the plan in the RECORD under Extension of Remarks.

In conclusion, may I say that unless the House wishes to go along with the administration in the negation of its own action of the last Congress in the passage of the excellent yet inexpensive Library Services Act, by its failure to appropriate adequate funds for its fulfillment, it will approve the full authorized amount of \$7,500,000. I strongly urge this independent action and the approval of the full appropriation of \$7,500,000.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 23.

Representative COYA KNUTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Minnesota has completed plans for use of its full share of funds under the Library Services Act. Entire membership of Minnesota Library Association urges your support for \$7,500,000 appropriation requested. Action now assures better rural library service in Minnesota.

JOYCE DAVENPORT,
Secretary, Minnesota Library Association.

LETTER FROM MOORHEAD PUBLIC LIBRARY

Knowing your interest in public library service for rural areas, prompts me to write to you concerning the appropriation recommendation of \$3 million for the Library Services Act by President Eisenhower instead of the full \$7,500,000 authorized. Here in Minnesota we feel quite sure of a State aid bill to be passed this session of the legislature to augment and supplement the Federal funds. The total amount authorized is a small amount when divided among the States as it is and a cutback would not permit the public library development program to succeed in doing what it aims to do. This Library Services Act was designed to stimulate greater effort by the States and localities in providing good local public library services. I am aware too of the need to balance the budget and economize but "one cannot live by bread alone." Books and library materials are needed to bring a fuller life to many of our people who live away from our cities which have library services of a greater or lesser degree.

I know that I need not say more than to remind you that we were sorry to see the appropriation cut back and wish it restored. Since this is a 5 year terminal program, it may be that a sufficient amount of funds will be forthcoming later. But we need a good impetus to start it off right.

STATEMENT ON THE RURAL LIBRARY SERVICES APPROPRIATION

The rural library services appropriations are of great concern to me. I am enclosing a copy of steps proposed by the Minnesota Library Service. This memorandum contains a list of counties in my district that have no service outside of a possible book-

mobile service. They are Kittson, Roseau, Marshall, Pennington, Red Lake, and Polk Counties.

I hope this short statement of the Minnesota Library Service (and, as I understand it, Minnesota is ahead in development of rural library service) will be of help to you in consideration of appropriations.

The full \$7,500,000 appropriation is very necessary in this project. The administration's proposal of half—less than half—that amount would not begin to cover the needs. I wish to be on record as supporting the full amount of \$7,500,000 in appropriations.

(Mrs. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the Committee will vote down this amendment. A year ago the House of Representatives voted to expend the sum of \$7½ million a year for a period of 5 years to match the States' expenditures in extending and improving library service in the rural areas. I do not think now it is a question of whether that was good or bad legislation. Personally I think it was excellent legislation, and that it was long overdue. But the question before us is, What is the Committee on Appropriations and what is the Committee of the Whole acting on an appropriation bill going to do about the request for funds to carry out the purpose of the legislation?

The bill which authorized the rural-library program was passed in June 1956, too late for the program to be considered in our committee hearings on the Department budget last year. When the appropriation bill was later taken up in the other body, they approved an appropriation of \$7½ million. When it went to conference the sum was fixed at \$2,050,000. That lesser sum was agreed on at that time because the program had not yet been put into effect, and it took time to work out the program. It takes several months to put one of these programs into effect. The Department was consulting with the States and conferring with various agencies in order to get the program started on a sound footing.

The Department makes up the budget some eight to ten months before we vote on it. Last fall, when the Department took up this request with the Bureau of the Budget, there were not many States that had reached the point of deciding to take part in the library program at that time. It was still in the conference stage, where details of the program were being explained to the States, and the Department had difficulty at that time justifying more than \$3 million to the Budget Bureau.

But by the time Department officials came before our committee in February to testify on the program, the picture was entirely different. At that time 27 States had plans for joining the program that were approved; 12 more States had submitted plans and 2 more States were preparing plans. At that time the Department either had approved or was considering State plans which it estimated then would call for Federal matching of \$6½ million.

I am rather interested in the statement that the Committee on Appropri-

ations is not compelled to appropriate money to carry out a program. Yet many objections are made from time to time about legislation on an appropriation bill. Certainly, if we refuse to appropriate money to carry out this library program based on the authorization, we would be legislating by way of an appropriation bill.

I am interested in that question further because there is one law now being carried out of which I do not approve in any way. That is the so-called wetback law, under the provisions of which you and I and all the other people in the United States are taxed so that the Government may go down and recruit labor in Mexico to come up and compete with and displace American labor. I do not like that legislation; I never voted for it. But once the legislation had become the law of the land, I felt appropriations had to be voted to carry it out. There was an item in this bill for \$2½ million for that purpose. Just the other day someone suggested we strike it out. But then it was agreed and we should not do that; that was not our function in making appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, let us remember this: We have enacted a library program and held it out to the States. They have gone ahead. There is a table in the record showing that the States have pledged more library money than this appropriation item calls for in Federal funds. The amount of money the States have authorized exceeds considerably that which Congress is going to put up. I think this bill should have provided at least \$6½ million.

Mr. Chairman, you know, I am a little old fashioned. I still believe that when you make a contract, you ought to keep it. In authorizing the rural library program last year, we in effect made a contract with the States. They have gone ahead and acted on it and if we did not carry it out we would be reneging on our promise. I certainly hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HIESTAND. Will the gentleman be frank to admit that the Department asked for an increase of 50 percent over their previous appropriation?

Mr. DENTON. I just explained the reason for that apparent increase. Perhaps I did not make my point clear. The reason they did not receive the authorized amount last year was that the program was new, it took time to put it into effect and the amount of \$2,050,000 was all that could be used for the program at that stage. Even when the second-year request came before the Budget Bureau last fall, still only about \$3 million could be justified. But when this agency came before us again this year they could well have asked for a supplemental appropriation, because of what had happened since the previous appropriation, and it would have gone through or should have with the library program in existing law, and with the commitments the States have made under it, there is a Federal obligation to grant

\$6,500,000 so that even with the \$5-million item in the bill, we are reneging by \$1,500,000.

Mr. HIESTAND. Is it not a fact that the committee raised even that request by 66 percent?

Mr. DENTON. I have tried to explain why we did it. If there had been a supplemental appropriation request for this program and the agency had come in and said we had made this agreement with the States, and therefore it asked for supplemental money, do you not think it should have been granted?

(Mr. BROWN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this crippling amendment on the grounds that this is the wrong place, the wrong time, and the wrong way to cut Government expenditures.

After all the total amount involved in this amendment is 1 cent per person in the United States. Surely, when we can help so many for so little, should we not carefully weigh any attempts to cripple an entire program?

And make no mistake about this: The people of Missouri have never expected the Federal Government to provide its education or library facilities. We have always done it ourselves.

For generations, we have made every possible sacrifice to provide facilities for education and improvement. We have bonded and taxed ourselves almost to the limit for schools and libraries. It has been a long and never-ending struggle; but our persistence has not gone unnoticed. People in richer areas have generously come to our aid through allocations from the State government.

Provisions for State aid to libraries are a noteworthy part of the Missouri constitution adopted in 1945. But in these times of national inflation and localized rural deflation, keeping librarians and maintaining libraries have become a serious problem in many of our rural communities.

We have the same ambitions for our children that we have always had, but we are constantly pressing against a "stone wall" of economic impossibility.

We want our children to read books. But books are more expensive than ever these days. It takes more money to pay librarians. How can we maintain library service when our incomes have not kept pace with rising costs? Some of our people are so worried about saving farms and paying off bank loans that they are forced to shove everything aside except the essential problems of daily living.

Yet, is this fair to the children? Each child "passes this way but once." And the books he does not read in the formative years will, perhaps, never be read. We might explain to him later that his education and that his development were neglected because of economic conditions, but the reasons or excuses will never really fill the void.

And, actually, the economic problems are not nationwide. They exist largely in certain rural areas. The Nation as a whole is enjoying the luxuries of record-breaking prosperity. There is ample

evidence that the great majority of the American people can be a good neighbor to these rural children if they so desire. I believe the people of America demonstrated that desire when they, through their Representatives and Senators in the 84th Congress, authorized a new 5-year program of Federal aid for library service to rural areas.

In committee hearings and on the floor of both the House and the Senate, ample evidence must have been presented to establish the need for the aid and the \$7½ million appropriation stipulated, because the Congress voted the authorization. The action came as welcome news to the people of south Missouri; and with the cooperation of State officials, our people proceeded to put their household in order to qualify for Federal funds.

Missouri has been counting on the \$40,000 allocated to Missouri in the original authorization. Missouri is prepared to provide the matching funds. All plans have been made on this basis.

But the President's budget recommendations would cut this figure to less than half the original amount authorized by Congress in this, the first year of the 5-year program.

So, where do we stand? Is this not a questionable beginning? Will there be proportionate cuts next year and the next? What can we really count on from this 5-year program that originally seemed so worth while and so promising?

We recognize the Government's problem. We are just as interested as anyone in saving the taxpayer's dollar. I, personally, already have cast more than one vote with the Appropriations Committee to cut Government expenditures wherever possible.

But is this a wise economy? Education facilities are about as time-honored and fundamental a responsibility of Government as police and fire protection.

If this Government has so many commitments in newer and more questionable fields of endeavor that it cannot fulfill its basic commitments for library facilities in sorely pressed areas that desperately need the temporary help, then I submit that this Government has gone too far afield and should closely scrutinize some of its other commitments.

This \$5 million is small, indeed, in the overall Federal Government picture. But we do not seek to justify it on that basis. If it were not needed, it would be wise to save the money, even if it were only 5 cents.

But this money is sorely needed in rural areas to provide education for children during these times when the parents are in no economic position to provide it themselves.

It is not easy for rural people to ask for help. Farm people are among the Nation's finest and proudest. But having asked for help and having received authorization for it, we now find it doubly disturbing to find ourselves asking Congress not to make it too little or too late.

We have been counting on it. We have made all our plans accordingly. We hope you will not let us down.

We urge this House to hold its ground and appropriate the original amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can get down a little closer to earth than this emotional appeal we have been treated to and look at the facts as they really are. We have not entered into any contracts with the States, so if we reduce these appropriations we shall be acting in the interest of real economy.

I wish it were possible to wipe out the entire matter because it is simply a matter of the camel getting his nose under the tent. The facts are that if you go along with this for \$3 million now, the people in the States are subject to this same political pressure the Congress is subject to, and they can justify their action by saying, "We are going to lose some Federal money if we do not go ahead and take it up, with the result, as was said just a few minutes ago, that there is planning now to take up \$6 million or more.

If you give them this \$5 million on this 5-year program, the next Congress will be requested to give \$7 million, the next \$10 million, and the next \$15 million on this program that never should have been authorized by the Federal Government. This thing should never have gotten started, because it will mushroom and mushroom and mushroom, and waste more millions each year.

We talk about getting this library service back into the country, to the people that ordinarily do not have access to libraries. What would it amount to for each State? About \$40,000 to a State, to set this bad example that we will increase, increase, and increase year after year.

I have the highest respect for the gentleman from Georgia. I seldom find myself differing with him on legislation. I know of his great interest in education, and I knew when he rose that he was going to speak for this bill. But in the great State of Georgia, part of which he so well represents, what would \$40,000 do, anyhow, or in any other State? And whose obligation is it to get education to these people?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The State of Illinois has been carrying on these traveling libraries for at least 20 years. The State is covered with these traveling libraries, and we do not ask Uncle Sam to do our work for us.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. Not at this point; a little later.

Mr. BAILEY. I wanted the gentleman to yield on the point raised by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to comment on it first.

Not only that, Congressman MASON, we are carrying on educational activities for the deaf and hard of hearing, for the blind and those partially able to see, for the physically handicapped, the socially maladjusted, and the speech defectives, and we are carrying on training for the mentally handicapped. Many States are doing the same thing, and they may eventually all do it in the same degree in time if the Federal Government will not impose upon them and offer them something for nothing and bring about an atmosphere of lethargy that will probably do more harm in the rural areas than good. Here is the thought I had in listening to one of the speeches. You are going to take these library services out to the people in the country. In my part of the State, you cannot tell a country boy and more on Saturday evening from the town boy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, if you look at his hands you can tell. The country boy's hands are calloused.

Mr. VURSELL. That is exactly right.

Mr. Chairman, here is the situation. What are we already doing for the school children? Why the Department of Agriculture alone is spending \$293 million in this next bill to help feed the children. We haul the children to school. We take them home. If the library service went to search for the schoolchild, as was referred to by a former speaker, they will not find him unless school is not in session because the State government has taken him to the centers of learning, mostly to the towns. Nearly all of the boys and girls in the country have approximately the same opportunities to get these books if they want them. Then we follow the schoolchildren right on up and when they go to the university, we build with our Federal money dormitories for them. And so on all the way through, one thing after the other. Now we want to do a lot of other things. There are a lot of other things that will be suggested later on. A lot of people want to get the Federal Government into the field of dealing with juvenile delinquency. The same thought is behind that. You want to take over the job that belongs to the State. You want to take over the job that belongs to the fathers and mothers in the homes. You want to take over the job that belongs to the schools in the various communities of the States. This thing ought never to have been started. One of the things that is driving this budget up is the constant thinking up of this and that and the other thing that the Federal Government can get into to please a few pressure groups of people with the result that you weight the Government down with millions of dollars of unnecessary expense. That only causes interference by the Federal Government attempting to do better for the people in the communities and in the States than they can do for themselves. So I would suggest that the thing to do is to reduce

this and save this much money at this time.

I just want to close by saying again that we are under no contract to the States. We cannot do any good, in my judgment, by passing this legislation and ultimately we might do harm. Most States—all States—every community is more able financially to take care of this problem than the Federal Government is with its debt of \$278 billion. Here is an opportunity for those who want to economize to save about \$2 million at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am completely opposed to the amendment that seeks to cut \$2 million from the \$5 million of grants to the States under the Rural Library Services Act of June 19, 1956, which this bill provides.

The Members who are opposed to \$5 million for these grants to the States, and who seek to reduce the amount from \$5 million to \$3 million, argue, generally, that they are opposed to the rural library services bill, and, secondly, that the President's budget for this item was \$3 million and that, therefore, it should not be raised above \$3 million.

However, as one of the original sponsors of the rural-library-services bill and as one who fought continuously for this program from about 1950 until it was enacted into law in 1956, I desire to call attention to the fact that it was well understood last year when we passed the bill that it would require \$7½ million to carry on the program each year for a period of 5 years.

Now what happened: Well, the first year, that is in the fiscal year 1957, we only provided a little over \$2 million for this program. Instead of \$7½ million we provided a little over \$2 million.

Now, if we approve the \$5 million provided by this bill, we will still be \$1½ million below the amount authorized for the next fiscal year.

Some of the Members today have said that this program most assuredly will not be over at the end of 5 years. Certainly those who insist on cutting the amounts allowed for these grants year after year are paving the way for the continuance of the program, because it has been understood all the way along that it will take at least \$7½ million per year for 5 years to get the program under way in such a manner as to give it the momentum necessary to carry it on after the 5-year period.

I would like to say again something which I said on this floor last year when the bill was before us: However great we consider ourselves to be, we build no structure on earth that outlasts a book.

We are a country of great natural resources. But we have no resource equal to the potentialities of the minds of the 27 million people in America without library service, and the 53 million who do not have an adequate library service.

Amid what we call the prosperity of these times, there seems to be a willingness to neglect the things of the mind. We give billions of dollars through favored tax treatment to stimulate our in-

dustrial development. We appear to be willing to give practically nothing to stimulate the development of the minds of the boys and girls of this Nation.

Five million dollars is little enough for this program. Actually, it is too little by at least a million and a half dollars. I urge the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to reject the amendment which would cut the amount to \$3 million.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, next to the house-to-house mail delivery man and rural mail carrier, the library service bill, approved by this Congress unanimously last year, comes nearer to the homes, and nearer to the lives of the American people than any other legislation approved by the Congress.

The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. BARDEN] was speaking my language when he took the floor earlier in this debate in defense of this legislation. It came out of the Committee on Education and Labor despite the fact that we are very much in turmoil in that committee over other basic legislation.

Here is one piece of legislation that the committee could report out unanimously. It came to be the law by reason of the unanimous vote on the floor of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is wrong there. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky. If I have time I will get around to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. If I remember correctly we undertook to pass this legislation first in 1950 but lost in the House by either 3 or 4 votes. Is not that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. I very well remember that. I was chairman of the subcommittee that offered the first library bill. The one that passed was reported out by a committee of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] was chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. It has been brought out here this afternoon in debate that notwithstanding the fact that this bill was enacted last year and the plans only reached the States after January 1 of this year, in the 1947 budget, 29 States now have taken advantage of the appropriation. Is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. All the States with the exception of 2 next year, at least 46 States during the fiscal year 1958, will share in this appropriation. Is that correct?

Mr. BAILEY. That is the estimate supplied by the Library Commission.

Mr. PERKINS. And with 46 States sharing in this appropriation next year, if the appropriation had been the full amount of the authorization of \$7,500,000, there would be at least \$7 million required for the fiscal year 1958 to put this program effectively into operation.

The Library Services Act was intended to assist and encourage the States in their efforts to give more adequate library services to rural areas. As a result of this encouragement, 46 States have

completed plans to enlarge their rural library services. These plans were developed and are now in the process of being put into operation, depending on the good faith of Congress in making the authorized appropriations for use by the States.

The fact that the States were unable to bear the entire burden of the cost of a program for which there was such a crying need in our rural areas, was the basic reason for the enactment of the Library Services law.

Now, are we to show lack of good faith by failing to appropriate the full amount authorized and force the States to drastically curtail their expansion program? I for one feel that I have incurred an obligation to support the full amount of \$7,500,000 per year, authorized for this program. Anything less than the \$5 million appropriation will destroy the effectiveness of the program. With the effectiveness of the program destroyed, the Congress could be confronted with appropriations long after the 5 years. If we intend to save the Government money and vote for real economy, let us vote down this amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky who has been an ardent supporter of this program. His efforts are deeply appreciated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I yield further, I would like to comment on the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. BAILEY. For the purpose of submitting a request that my time be extended? Yes, Mr. Chairman, I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman at his discretion yield to me?

Mr. BAILEY. Now I will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I believe the gentleman stated that the bill passed the House by a unanimous vote. I do not think he wants that to stand, for I know that was not the situation.

Mr. BAILEY. I asked someone over here at the committee desk and I am giving the gentleman the answer I got. I may be in error. If the vote was not unanimous, there was only a smattering of votes against it, and there was no roll call.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I have to yield to the gentleman who got me the 2 minutes

extra time, but I would like to have an opportunity to say something myself.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my personal opinion that this amendment goes too deep. I cannot support an amendment which takes \$2 million out of this item. This is one of the very few times I have opposed a cut in appropriations, but I cannot support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. This is a very good program and we should provide the funds to make it operative. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to agree with the gentleman from Minnesota. I think it was wrong that the amendment was ever offered.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I think the statement was made a few minutes ago that the State of Illinois did not seek any of these funds. As a matter of fact the State of Illinois has approved a plan under this program and is presently seeking matching funds up to \$230,000.

Mr. BAILEY. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the State Legislature of Illinois has made moneys available by an appropriation of \$230,178. They have filed their State plan and are asking to have an equal amount of Federal matching money.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How many States had bookmobiles before the Federal Government stepped into the picture?

Mr. BAILEY. As I recall, about nine when we first started this proposal some years ago.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The States had been carrying on for some time before the Federal Government came in?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this legislation only implements what those States were doing. Illinois had a program at that time and they found it was good. When they found out they could get some Federal funds they enlarged their programs and have made funds available. I do not think the gentleman from Illinois speaks the same language as the State Legislature of Illinois is speaking. They made the money available.

Mr. MASON. I was in the State legislature when this thing was started.

Mr. BAILEY. Then the gentleman ought to know what he is talking about.

Mr. MASON. Of course, every single State that has qualified so far had a setup of this kind before the Federal Government went in.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the gentleman is wrong there. There were 9 States some 4 or 5 years ago when we first started the proposal to make Federal grants in that particular field.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that have been made regarding

this particular appropriation item, I think it is well if Members of the House realize that this particular program is in a very early stage of development and that it is impossible to tell at this time exactly what amount of money will be made available by the various State legislatures for this program in fiscal year 1958.

If you will turn to page 255 of the hearings conducted by this committee, you will find that at the time the testimony was taken there were some 14 States where State plans had been approved. Since that time there have been a number of States that have secured approval for their State plans here in the Office of Education. The mere approval of the State plan does not necessarily mean that each of the States have made a State appropriation for this rural library service work. Our committee placed \$5 million in this bill as an estimate as to what would be used in fiscal 1958. This amount could be all used or only a part of it used depending on the actions of State and local communities on their 1958 budgets.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman says that at the time the testimony was given there were only 14 plans of the various States approved. Is he able to tell the committee whether exactly 100 percent more plans have been approved since that testimony was given before the committee?

Mr. LAIRD. I believe there are some 27 that have been approved up to this time. However, the approval of the Office of Education does not necessarily mean that the State legislatures in those 27 States have appropriated the funds. This fact cannot be determined with certainty until the end of April or early May.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say to the gentleman it is my information, and I think my information is correct, that 38 States will participate this year in this \$2,050,000 1957 appropriation.

Mr. LAIRD. That may be approximately correct, but you cannot tell how much money will actually be made available by the State legislatures and local communities at this time for fiscal year 1958. The 15th or 16th State to receive approval for its State library plan was my own State of Wisconsin. In order for me to find out what position Wisconsin would be in as far as this program was concerned for 1958, I contacted the chairman of the Wisconsin Legislature's Joint Finance Committee. I wanted to ascertain whether or not Wisconsin was depending on this Federal money. I received a wire, which I have before me, that the finance committee was divided 6 to 6, on matching any new Federal money. Such a vote means that new State money for this program would not be approved. This same situation may exist in other States. For that reason the statements made by some on the floor of the House today that the amount in this bill or the amendment are not enough to match State appropriations

could be in error. Certainly by the time this bill is considered by the other body our estimates as to the matching funds by the States will be much more of a certainty.

The mere approval of a State plan here in Washington does not necessarily mean that the State legislatures or local units of government will follow through and make appropriations available for the program called for in the State plan in fiscal year 1958.

I would like to further state that the State plans which the gentleman from West Virginia referred to do not require the approval of the State legislature in each of the 48 States but are merely a plan submitted to the Office of Education by the executive agencies of the several States. The State legislature acts through its various finance committees in each of our States, and it may be that this program is running into the same sort of difficulties in other States as seems to be indicated by the joint finance committee of the Wisconsin legislature in our State.

Sometimes here in Washington we get out of tune with the feelings of local units of government.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman does not intend to tell the committee that 38 States will not submit plans and be able to match Federal money?

Mr. LAIRD. My statement was that it is impossible at this time to tell whether the State legislatures and local units of government in those 38 States will make available the funds called for in the State plans in fiscal year 1958. That was the only statement I made.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. The gentleman is aware that the estimate of the Department was that it would take \$6,581,000 for this program.

Mr. LAIRD. Based on the State plans not on actual appropriations.

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. The Department could give no estimate as to the exact amount of funds which would be made available by the States for this particular work. Of course, it must be pointed out, too, that as this plan was brought before the Congress in the last session, by the Committee on Education and Labor, on the basis that it would increase State and local activities. These particular Federal funds would be matched by both the State and local governments through increased local appropriations. I believe the gentleman from Indiana agrees with me that at this time we cannot exactly estimate the amount of these new funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am sorry that my

good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California, offered this particular amendment. I do not know how his mail is running, but certainly I have been getting some rather extensive mail from the State of California, all very much opposed to any reduction in this particular appropriation; in fact, in most cases it has indicated a feeling that it should have been a larger appropriation. I, too, am concerned with every reduction that we can possibly make, but this seems again to me to be a case of overzealousness. I also just had an opportunity to look over the record on the passage, on May 7 last year, of the Library Services Act. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] was down here today and made a very strong plea against this, and I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, but at the time this bill was under consideration—and I have just surveyed the record in the last half-hour—apparently the gentleman did not feel called upon at that time to oppose the legislation. I will say this for another gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], he very vigorously opposed this legislation at the time, and certainly I admire the gentleman for being completely consistent today. But it seems to me that last year on May 7 would have been the time to have made sure that we would not have been faced with this particular appropriation simply by having killed the proposed legislation at the time. I do not find—and I may be wrong; I may have overlooked it—I do not find the name of my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand] in opposition on that day, either.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Does the gentleman have any idea from the past record of this Congress that this program, if it is given the funds that it asked for, has any possibility of being terminated at the end of 5 years?

Mr. SISK. Well, I realize, of course, I will say to the gentleman, that no Congress can bind a future Congress, and it may be that Congress at the end of this program or a Congress sometime in the future might feel called upon to continue the program. I just do not know. I know that it is a very popular program.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I served with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum] and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] on this subcommittee that studied this program. We felt that if we could build a fire for 5 years, and have \$7½ million to do it, we would be able to end the program forever.

Mrs. Gray, of the National Parents and Teachers Association, came before the committee and she reminded us of the great work that Carnegie had done, going out into the local communities and providing libraries, turning them over to the local communities for their support.

This subcommittee, of which I was a member, came before this Congress and said, "If you will give us the \$7½ million for the 5-year program, the program will be over and we will not come back and ask you for any more money. But if you deprive us of that, and starve this young program of the necessary money, the \$7½ million, then who knows how long it will take to build the fire that we hope to build in the local communities."

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from Montana. I should like to conclude my statement by saying that I hope we will vote down this particular amendment, because I think this is a vital program, it is a good program, and certainly the Congress as recently as only a year ago endorsed this program. It would be my hope that we would keep the program going and do everything we possibly can to improve the educational and the library facilities of our country.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this argument has brought up several questions which are of interest. While sitting here with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. Knox], and he called my attention to the fact that throughout the debate on the bill we have many times been told that the Congress had authorized a program and therefore we would have to go along with whatever was in the budget, or approximately that. Told that because there was an authorized project by that action we became obligated to make appropriations sufficient to carry it on indefinitely, and also, from time to time expand it.

These programs grow. They put Topsy to shame when it comes to growing. Nor is referring to the tendency of the snowball to increase an apt illustration. An avalanche started by the passage of a bill is more accurate. This program was just recently adopted. We should keep in mind the statement that so often is made when there is an authorization before us. We are then told, we have been told time and time again, when asked to support an authorization, that it is not an appropriation and does not in any way bind us. That passing an authorization does not mean we are committed to agree to an appropriation. Then when the appropriation bill comes to us we are confronted with the fact that we authorized the project. We are then told that we have by the authorization, made a promise, we must keep our word, not violate what we are told is a contract with the States. It makes the whole procedure a little confusing.

The Member of the House from the Fourth District of Michigan listened very carefully to the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. BARDEN]. I had no difficulty whatever in going along with everything the gentleman said except his conclusions. Throughout the years he has many times stated that he was in favor of the States exercising their rights as reserved to

them by the Constitution. The gentleman does not wish control of State policies or acts by the Federal Government, that has been the position of many of us. But here today the gentleman is in support of this Federal Library program contribution by the Federal Government. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who is doing such a remarkably fine job, holding the line for the States rights people, for constitutional government realizes what this item in this bill would do to that doctrine. The Federal Government puts its money into the program. Beyond question the Federal Government will exercise some control over the books and publications that will be circulated through that library, unless the gentleman goes along with those States which are now in effect saying and announcing publicly that they will not follow the recent Supreme Court decision on segregation.

If the Federal Government participates in this program, does anyone have any idea, can anyone say with any degree of assurance, what kind of books will be in that circulating library? No, no. The children in the South in those backwoods 30 miles from the city, way, way back down and along the country road, they will not be reading Uncle Tom's Cabin, they will be reading Huckleberry Finn or Tom Sawyer or Penrod or Seventeen, they will be reading those books rather than the publications put out by the leftwingers, by those writers who find it profitable to stir up discord and strife, if Washington has something to say about it and official Washington will have much to say. The gentleman's constituents, big and little, old and young, will be reading trouble-making trash. They will be reading something which preaches desegregation, which may be all right and which may be all wrong. But I just wonder if the distinguished chairman thought of that when he advocated the extension of this program.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will you get me a half a minute, or 1 minute?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, I will.

Mr. MASON. I will get you some time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I do not want to yield to the gentleman. I want to yield to the gentleman to whom I just referred. All right, now I will yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I just wanted to reply to the gentleman. You asked me if I had given thought to this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. I certainly have given a lot of thought to this bill. If I thought for one moment that the Federal Government would have one thing in this world to do with the selection of the books, or that this program would be controlled by any other than where it is now being controlled, then I expect I would be in the same corner as the gentleman. I am States rights through and through, and I think the gentleman is fast joining me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Joining you? I am with the gentleman on this issue. He has been a consistent and aggressive advocate of sound government and policy. Many things of value have I learned from the gentleman both in committee and in the House. It has been a pleasure and profitable in a legislative way to follow him on occasion.

Mr. MASON. Now will the gentleman yield? I want to ask unanimous consent to get the gentleman more time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to ask unanimous consent that I may have about 3 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must admonish the gentleman that yesterday he made a point of order about Members referring to other Members in the second person. He has violated that rule today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. I do not know whether the transcript will show that or not. It probably will. I tried each time to say "the distinguished gentleman from Georgia," or "the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor." If I ever say "you," I will welcome the suggestion of the Chair that I come to order. The rule has been violated at least 50 times today without any suggestion from the Chairman that I have heard that the rule be observed. Permit me to commend the Chairman for his vigilance and diligence on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, under permission previously granted to revise and extend my remarks, permit me to attempt to conclude at least a part of the argument which was in my mind when I arose to address the Committee.

As to other Members of the House, to me have come many letters, some requesting, some demanding, that I vote for the increased appropriation to carry on the library program. Usually, these letters have commended me for my economy record and have urgently requested, sometimes demanded, that the Congress reduce the budget.

Often the letters call attention to the huge public debt; to what the writers consider not only an exorbitant but a wasteful foreign-aid program; to the grievous tax burden which we have placed upon them.

It is obvious, as the President so well said at his last news conference, that there can be neither a reduction of the public debt nor a substantial cut in the budget nor a lessening of the tax burden if we are to continue many of the helpful and desirable programs which have been suggested either by the administration or by individual Members of Con-

gress, but which are not necessary and which we cannot afford.

Listening to the debate on this bill during the last few days causes me to wonder how Washington, Franklin, and all the others who lived and distinguished themselves in those days were able to exist without the aid of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

Yes, the Member from Michigan remembers that history tells us that, when Washington lost his teeth, all he was able to get to replace them were wooden substitutes. We recall that it is reported that, when he fell ill, the top physicians of those days bled him to death.

No one is suggesting that we, as a people or as individuals, make no effort to improve our situation, increase our advantages. On the other hand, in view of the record which has been made, it seems absurd to assume that we now cannot live, prosper, be happy, and contented, except as we grievously tax one segment of the population to support another segment.

Especially is this true when we know that, by so doing we actually hinder progress by taking away the incentive to work, practice thrift, so that the dollars we save can be used for expansion, new industries, the creation of more jobs.

To mind comes the example of Lincoln, who, we are told, at times lived miles from a school; who had but a half dozen books during his youth. He certainly had no electric light to aid him with his studies.

No one contends that we all are or can be Lincolns. But each of us can, if he so desires, get a worthwhile and sufficient education without any aid from the Federal Government.

Another angle of this program, one to which reference was previously made and called to the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], was the kind and the quality of the books which it is almost certain will get into these libraries which, as he said, will be carried, through Federal aid, to the children who live on the back or side roads.

One of the very helpful acts of the good wife, with whom I have lived for more than 57 years, is to go to the Federal library each week, where she gets for me what are called "westerns."

Tired after a day's work on the floor and in the House; not enjoying golf, cocktail parties, or social events, my recreation is in part at least the reading of the westerns. They replace to some extent Jay Fenimore Cooper's Last of the Mohicans, The Prairie, Oak Openings, The Spy—yes, several others.

Zane Grey's novels long provided me with pleasure and a drowsiness which let me drift off for a peaceful rest and recuperation.

Recently, however, on several occasions, when the good wife was asked as to which of the westerns she had obtained from the library, she has suggested that I skip certain books because, as she said, "You won't care to read them." Without asking, I know to what she refers—this for the reason that, over the last few years, many of these otherwise worthwhile westerns, on page after

page, have carried obscene, profane, and suggestive words, sentences, and paragraphs.

As to the suggestive passages, there might be a difference of opinion, but for the dirty, obscene, vulgar and profane language, there should be no excuse.

Yet these books are in the public library. They are available to the young, those in formative state of mind, as well as to the older people who have sense enough to lay them aside or to disregard their content.

Public-spirited citizens of Michigan, parents and others, who were alarmed at the spread of youthful delinquency, through the action of thoughtful legislators, obtained the enactment of a State statute barring what was considered to be profane or obscene publications.

Just recently, the United States Supreme Court declared our Michigan statute unconstitutional because it violated the first amendment guaranteeing a free press and free speech.

My memory is that one of the reasons was that, even though the publications might be unsuitable or even unfit for youth to read, because free speech was a constitutional guaranty, the rights of adults under the first amendment could not be infringed, even though the purpose was to protect the youth of the land.

On the same theory it might be said that some of our criminal statutes might restrain youth but could not restrict the freedom of the adult.

The Court which rendered the decision referred to is the same Court which held that a slight beating on the picket line was excusable because, in the words of one of the Justices:

The right of free speech cannot be denied by drawing from a trivial rough incident or a moment of animal exuberance the conclusion that otherwise peaceful picketing has the taint of force. (*Milk Wagon Drivers Union v. Meadowmoor Dairies* (312 U. S. 293).)

It is the same Court, some may recall, which a few years ago held that an act passed by the Congress to outlaw racketeering applied only to racketeering by the Dillinger type of criminal—not to extortion which was an established union practice.

True, as some may argue, we should first consider the interests of our own people before extending aid aggregating billions to other nations. But the argument that we should leave the attempt to reduce Federal expenditures until after consideration of the bill extending foreign aid is beside the point.

We should cut the budget all along the line, until the total is within our ability to pay. In my judgment, the fact, if it be a fact, that foreign aid will be drastically cut is no reason for leaving larger than necessary amounts in our domestic programs or for going along with new programs, however desirable, while the tax burden is so grievous, the interest-bearing debt so large.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the agreement we entered into that the Committee would rise between 3 and 3:30, when we finish this amendment it will be our intention to do that. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 minutes past 3, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, we have been asked to think this library appropriation through very carefully. That is what I have been doing. I would like to offer my thinking briefly—and I will be brief.

In the First Utah Congressional District, there are 25 counties. That is the district I represent. Nineteen of those counties are in the drought area and rural people are in distress. The great State of Utah is owned to the extent of 72 percent by the Federal Government. Most of the Federal land is in these 25 counties. The people in these rural areas and throughout our whole State are making a greater effort than any State in the Union except two for education and for the enlightenment of their children. They have been trying for 4 or 5 terms of the State legislature to get help for their libraries, but the legislation has failed every time until now. The authorization bill we passed last year was just the help they needed. This month our legislature passed a measure providing \$100,000 out of property taxes, which they can ill afford, to match Federal library funds which shows that they love their children more than they love things. The legislature appropriated that money and passed an act which enabled our State to benefit by this authorization bill of Congress.

I hope after they made this sacrifice we are not going to break faith with them by turning our backs on them. This bill has already been cut from \$7,500,000 to \$5 million and this amendment, which I oppose, would take it down to \$3 million. It is too severe a cut. It is uneconomical economy.

Mr. Chairman, once in a while a story does not hurt so I will just tell a short story and then I will sit down.

I was raised in the adobe yard district where people are poor. During the depression, we had a neighbor who was very sick. We told him to go to a doctor. He told us he could not afford it. We raised a little money and demanded that he go to the doctor. The doctor put barium in his stomach and took X-ray pictures of his stomach. He called my neighbor in after a couple of days and said, "I have to restrict your diet." This neighbor of mine said, "No, Doctor, don't, please." "Yes," the doctor said, "you will die unless I restrict your diet." Well, this neighbor said, "O. K. All I get to eat now is suckers and watercress. Which are you going to take away from me?" Mr. Chairman, that is about the case with these children's book funds. I am not a bit afraid of enlightenment. There are all too many of our boys being rejected from the Army and from the

military services because they have not had educational privileges. I think this cut of \$2 million is uneconomical economy. I am against the amendment, and I am all for the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. May we interpret the gentleman's remarks to mean that he is in favor of the general principle of Federal aid to education?

Mr. DIXON. Absolutely. That is for school construction for the next 3 or 4 years.

Mr. HIESTAND. I just wanted to get the gentleman on record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that we have spent about as much time on this minor amendment—several million—as we spent on the entire foreign-aid bill last year, carrying about \$4 billion, or \$4 thousand million. If we gave a like consideration to the foreign-aid bill when it comes before the House, you might effect considerable saving that would really reduce the budget.

I also want to remind you that a million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars; and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars. If you want to effect a real dent in the budget when the foreign-aid bill comes on the floor carrying \$4 billion, just cut it \$2 thousand million and you will be making a real contribution. I hope you will spend as much time in the careful consideration of that bill as you are spending on this school-library program here.

A great many of my friends on my side of the aisle have voted consistently against foreign aid, but last year when President Eisenhower was running on a program of peace, progress, and prosperity, some of these same gentlemen who are now economy minded gave the program real support and voted for foreign aid programs they had never supported before. When we reach debate on the foreign-aid bill where you can do some real cutting, I am going to be watching the voting, and you are going to have that opportunity to be recorded. I am going to watch the position they take this time on the cuts in the foreign-aid bill where real economies can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey yielded his time to Mr. GAVIN.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of the House to these foreign-aid programs that I consistently opposed for 10 or more years unsuccessfully, that I have made several official trips to Europe as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I want to say, after observing conditions in Europe, that I can take you to places in some parts of my district the like of which I did not see anywhere in Europe. There economic recovery is about complete. When it comes to the rehabilitation of opera houses, the building of railroad stations, the building of highway projects, waterway projects, flood-control projects, and every conceivable project in other countries, many seem to go all out; in fact, foreign aid has now become a part of our annual budget so let us not get too wrought up over this library project.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point, as I have but a minute and a half.

Foreign aid, it would appear, is now part of our regular budget and is just as much considered as the Post Office Department, judiciary or agriculture or public works or any department of Government. It has become accepted as part of our budget. You accept it; not me. In fact, there is talk now about 10-year foreign-aid programs. Two billion off foreign aid would make a nice tax reduction for the American taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Does some generous Member want to yield me his time? No offers, so I can go no further.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of the Library Services Act, I was pleased to see that the House Appropriations Committee increased the appropriation for the Library Services Act by \$2 million over the amount recommended in the budget. This important program, which came into being in 1956, has progressed splendidly in this first year of operation. I urge the membership to vote the \$5 million, which was recommended by the committee for the Library Services Act grants to the States for rural library services.

The legislation became law last June 19 when the President affixed his signature to it. The fall was devoted to getting the program underway. Two people from each of the State library agencies attended 1 of 4 regional conferences held to acquaint these persons with the administration of the program, the legal interpretations of the new law, and the methods of submitting their State plan. The State agency personnel had an opportunity to see and discuss the tentative regulations. It was the early part of December before the regulations were published in the Federal Register, and it was almost the end of December before the States received the forms necessary in submitting their plan. In spite of this, there are already 38 State plans on file, including 2 territorial plans. Twenty-six of these have been approved and al-

ready have their State plan in operation. My own State was one of the first to have its plan approved.

You will recall that last year only \$2,050,000 was appropriated for this program in the closing days of the session. This allowed each State only the basic amount of \$40,000 for the current year. This year the President's budget recommended only \$3 million, very little more than that appropriated last year. We all know that this recommended amount was made up last fall, before a single State plan had been approved. We know now that the States are ready for this program and should be given sufficient funds to do the job authorized by this law. I really feel the full amount of the authorization, \$7,500,000, should be appropriated. However, in view of the economy drive, I will support the \$5 million recommended in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] is recognized.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mrs. PFOST. I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks immediately following those of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening for the last 4 days to these attacks that have been made on what I regard as programs essential in the interest of human welfare, and I was about to conclude that economy is now the chief end of man. So it came as something of a surprise to me last night when I took a look at the Scriptures and discovered that neither in the Old Testament nor in the New Testament is the word "economy" mentioned a single time.

What I did find is that the chief virtues are summarized by the Apostle Paul as "faith, hope, and charity," and "the greatest of these," he said, is charity.

I know that the Members of Congress want to keep their politics consistent with their religion. Since there seems to be little chance of convincing some gentlemen that charity is still a virtue worth preserving, I am wondering if we should not revise the Scriptures to read: "Faith, hope, and economy, and the greatest of these is economy"?

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to cut \$2 million from the appropriation to implement the Library Services Act.

I know what pressures have been applied to the committee to reduce the President's budget requests. I deeply appreciate the fact that in response to the pleas of many Members—including myself—the committee increased library funds from \$3 million to \$5 million. This was fine and courageous action. I hope the House will not nullify it by cutting the Library funds back to the low and inadequate figure in the budget request.

Mr. Chairman, we need the great benefits from the Library Services Act in

Idaho—and we need them now. More than half of the population of my State has no library service at all.

Our State legislature, which has just adjourned, increased the budget of our State library board by 150 percent in anticipation of Federal assistance. Local organizations, such as the Jaycees and the State Federation of Women's Clubs, are standing by to conduct statewide drives to collect additional funds if they are needed.

Remarks of other Members today indicate that there is similar support for the program throughout the country. We must make the most of the people's enthusiasm and will to work by appropriating enough money to make the library services program a going concern.

A strong, robust library system is just as important as a strong highway system. Books are a vital force in molding the character of our young, and in giving mind-stretching opportunities to our adults. In this progressive and prosperous country of ours all people should have access to libraries—all people should know the joys and educational values of borrowing and reading good books.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. First of all I want to say, in response to the gentleman who has just spoken, that economy is charity on the part of the Government toward the taxpayers. That is the kind of charity I favor.

It seems to me that some of my good people back home have an impression—at least I am afraid they have—that in the last 3 or 4 days we have been cutting Government spending. Of course, that is a completely mistaken impression. The fact of the matter is that about all we have been doing is cutting some of the increases in the expenditures that are proposed in the budget. The best that we have done, with possibly 1 or 2 exceptions, is to hold the line back to the 1957 fiscal year budget. So we are not doing very much in the way of cutting actual expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not adopt the amendment that has been offered, so far as this particular instance is concerned, we will be increasing the current year's appropriation by 2½ times. If we adopt the amendment we will be cutting it back to \$3 million which will still be a 50-percent increase over the current year's budget. So we are still not doing any real saving.

What we have here is a perfect example of a good cause and a good program that is being brought under Federal subsidy and Federal expenditures where it does not belong, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that on the floor of the House today we have been warned that this program is a program to apply

force to the States, to build a fire under the States, to make the States do what Uncle Sam thinks they ought to do.

Let me also call attention to the fact that no one questions the essentiality of this library work. We are all agreed it is essential and we want it. The question simply is, Whose duty and whose responsibility is it to provide these essential services?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed the lecture on consistency given to us by the gentleman from South Dakota. I rise only to call his attention and the attention of some of my friends on the Democrat side that it was just a little over 2 weeks ago, on March 12 to be exact, that they put on a great battle and we heard many lectures about economy and the necessity of reducing the President's budget. They went on record specifically, and let me quote the very beginning of the resolution that was sponsored and promoted by the other side of the aisle:

The House of Representatives must in the public interest make substantial reductions in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1958.

Please note the use of the word "must."

Now, may I remind my friends that all the amendment before the House attempts to do is to bring the amount to be appropriated for this function down to the amount recommended in the President's budget. The committee increased the budget amount by \$2 million.

How are you going to reduce the budget by increasing items in it? Let us have some consistency. If we are going to say that the budget must be reduced, we better not be promoting and voting for increases in that budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, we have here, as I see it, a question of basic principle. I am very appreciative of the very fine and well expressed sentiments of the chairman of the Committee on Education and others who have espoused the cause of education, rural education. It is a wonderful idea, and all of the good work that is being done should be commended. But, the question is not for or against rural education; the question is Federal Government aid. If we wish to debate that issue, that is a big one and it is a very dangerous one. This, as I see it, is clearly a State responsibility. When it comes to Federal aid, we can make a record or two about the delusion of Federal aid. Is there anything sound about it, in any way, shape, or manner to tax everybody and then redistribute equally, as this provision does, \$40,000 per State? Does that make sense? Is Federal aid fundamentally sound? There is your question. Now, as has been well said, this is a compromise. It allows a 50 percent increase from last year's appropriation and is all the Department asked for. I hope the amendment will carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, to me this is just one more Federal agency set up in a most ridiculous manner. What State in the United States is so bad off that it has to have a handout from the Federal Government of \$40,000 or \$50,000 or \$60,000? The more times we create additional agencies—and they snowball and snowball and snowball—the more times we hurt education and make it worse and worse and worse and harder and harder and harder for the folks back home to do a job. Now, the situation that this creates, you are going to see if you go along with this thing, will snowball year after year. On top of that, it will encourage idealists to try to create another agency and set up another Federal department. It is about time that we began to show some sense and integrity in our approach to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted and that we will save what we can in this picture.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do in going \$2 million over the Bureau of the Budget figure is to enlighten the minds of about 27 million people in this country living in rural areas who have no libraries at all and another 53 million that have inadequate services all over this country.

Now, where the local community or the State does not do anything about starting programs like this, I think it is reasonable to assume that the Federal Government should stimulate these projects. But, as the gentleman from New York just mentioned, this is not going to blossom out into any big program at all. The legislation calls for a 5-year program of \$7.5 million a year, and that is all. It cannot go to \$10 million or \$15 million or \$25 million as it has been inferred here today by Members on the Republican side, unless you change the basic law.

In the closing days of the last session this authorization passed this House with a practically unanimous vote. There were not enough noes to ask for a division vote. That is how unanimous it was. And, you authorized the expenditure of \$7.5 million and the Bureau of the Budget allowed \$7.5 million for this fiscal year. When we went to conference we cut it down to \$2,050,000 on the basis that the legislation had just been enacted, and we gave the minimum amount to every State, which is a grant of \$40,000, to stimulate these programs in the rural areas.

Now, what happened this year? After they asked for \$7.5 million for 1957, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cut that down to \$5 million for 1958, and the Bureau of the Budget then cut it down to \$3 million. When we came to mark up this bill, after we were told of the plans already adopted by the States, that they could use about \$6.5 million in 1958, we tried in subcommittee to get \$6 million appropriated for this program, not 5. As a result of a com-

promise we have come to you today asking for \$5 million when \$6½ million can be spent efficiently and economically in 1958.

This is a program that will vastly benefit every State in the Nation, not just the large agricultural States. For instance, I have received a wire from my own State of Rhode Island that I include in the RECORD now.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., March 25, 1957.
Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
United States Representative, Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Your support of the Library Services Act most appreciated by librarians of Rhode Island. We hope that floor vote of the House will support recommendations of your committee.

RHODE ISLAND LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
WALTER CURLEY.

I hope that this amendment is defeated.

(Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, the consideration of H. R. 6287, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, presents a situation which should be called to the attention of the American public. The same situation will exist in all of the other agencies in the Federal Government and, as you know, there are many, many such agencies, commissions, and bureaus. In fact, the enormous size of the Federal bureaucracy is astounding to the folks back home and I believe that all of us find it very difficult to explain or even justify the size of some of these agencies.

Very recently one of the Washington newspapers carried a story indicating that if the proposed personnel increases provided in the present budget were approved then there would be an increase in the Federal civilian employment totalling 22,359 more people than are employed at the present time. Even at an average minimum salary of \$5,000 per year, this is going to cost the taxpayers more than \$100 million extra per year. The taxpayers rightfully ask the question—will we be getting our money's worth out of this added investment?

The civilian personnel changes by departments were listed as follows in this news article:

Personnel changes—civilian

Department	Increase	Decrease
Army.....	2,000	
Navy.....		1,848
Air Force.....		4,262
Justice.....	106	
Labor.....	346	
Post Office (4,886 field).....	124	
Agriculture (1,844 field).....	440	
Commerce (5,102 field).....	928	
Health, Education, and Welfare (2,405 field).....	1,283	
Interior (1,582 field).....	288	
State (330 field).....	268	
Treasury (1,606 field).....	1,329	
Veterans' Administration (2,120 field).....		237
General Services Administration (1,113 field).....	653	
Housing and Home Finance (-188 field).....	27	
Library of Congress.....	65	
Total (increase in field 20,800).....	+7,906	-6,347

In this list there are several interesting questions that can be raised. For example, if the Navy and Air Force can reduce their civilian personnel, why is it necessary for the Army to increase theirs by 2,000? Even with a large decrease in civilian personnel employment in December 1956, the total number of civilian employees at the end of the last calendar year came to a total of 2,389,792. All of this has happened in the face of the fact that many people have been expressing concern about an ever-growing Federal bureaucracy.

These remarks are not in any sense to be construed that the agencies for which they work are not doing good work. On the contrary, all of these agencies have much of merit and the public is proud of some of their accomplishments. However, the question must be raised and is being raised in the minds of the public, and I hope in the minds of the legislators, How much of this can we afford? The second question that is equally important is whether or not the Federal bureaucracy has grown so large that it is assuming the authority that rightfully belongs to the Congress. It seems very much like the tail is wagging the dog. Is it not time that the Congress assert its authority and designate to the various agencies the limits in which they may operate due to financial limitations within their own Government and their own people?

I say financial limitations advisedly because too often too many people think the United States is a wealthy Nation. God has been good to us but we should not dissipate all of His gratuities in wasteful spending.

For example, the March 1 Economic Council letter lists the United States indebtedness as \$280,800,000,000. It also lists 26 other great nations of the world and their total indebtedness is estimated at \$152,580,000,000. Thus, the Federal debt of the United States is nearly twice as great as the debt of the other 26 countries combined.

This same newsletter also offers additional interesting research. For example, the present proposed budget of the United States is \$71,800,000,000. For 32 other countries of the world, from which information is available, the total budgets or expenditures approved total \$59,802,000,000. Thus, the proposed United States budget is 17 percent greater than the combined spending of the other 32 countries. No figure is given or is available for the spending of Soviet Russia. An estimate is said to be in the neighborhood of \$42 billion per year.

This raises the often repeated question: "How big is your Government?"

If the Members will look carefully at the committee report that accompanies H. R. 6287, on practically every page and in nearly every section, there is a recommended increase in personnel. It is very true that some of this was authorized by previous legislation and that should be a warning to the Members of Congress that they should take a hard look at any legislation that would increase costs to the taxpayers in any manner. Many of these increases are justified and should be passed, but is it not equally true that the present staffs can function ade-

quately in the performance of the necessary duties and the necessary functions of Government.

I serve on a House committee which is charged with the responsibility and jurisdiction of legislation pertaining to many of these Federal agencies. Frankly, we are confronted consistently with the problem, or apparent necessity, of legislating specific instructions in order that these agencies will not overstep their authority. If a system continues wherein agencies tell the Congress what to do, then do you not think it is time that the Congress assume its prerogatives and contain this ever-increasing bureaucracy in order that it will function for the good of the people throughout the country rather than for the members of that bureaucracy? Let us approve a sound budget instead of a luxury budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand].

(The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hiestand) there were—ayes 71, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks on the amendment just voted on at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, we are all interested in economy—sound and proper economy—but in this instance, I feel that our friend, in proposing this cut, is going too far in requesting cuts against the children of this Nation.

As we all know, the Congress has authorized the sum of \$7½ million annually to carry forward the rural library program. Last year only \$40,000 was provided for each of the 48 States for use on a matching fund basis for this purpose. The committee felt that an amendment to cut this program was unwise and in the long run would represent false economy so, therefore, the committee very wisely, in my judgment, approved \$5 million for this program for the next year. This is a reduction of \$2½ million for the full amount authorized.

I looked into the matter of the amount of funds provided for library programs for other agencies and other purposes. The United States Information Agency received an appropriation of \$3 million last year to operate and supply library services overseas. This year this Agency is asking \$3,800,000 for library programs maintained overseas by the United States Information Agency—an increase of \$800,000 for this purpose.

In this same category, the Atomic Energy Commission is providing grants of atomic information and technical libraries to 40 nations. I was somewhat startled by the statement of Chairman Strauss of the AEC. He indicated that this Commission had granted, given and provided libraries of atomic information to 40 nations. The Congress appropriated \$77,500 for the AEC budget for

last year. Fiscal 1958 calls for \$97,000 for overseas library programs.

My point is this, Mr. Chairman, if we can appropriate millions of dollars to finance the overseas library programs of the United States Information Agency and the Atomic Energy Commission—if we can afford to make grants of complete libraries to other nations then most certainly we should be able to provide assistance to the States on a matching fund basis for libraries of the children in areas where educational aids are greatly needed. The public library services program is designed to bring books and libraries to children in our rural families where citizens are without library facilities enjoyed by our citizens in cities and metropolitan areas.

One further word on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I have noted with interest the Department of Agriculture during last year expended \$24 million on the Bang's disease problem to protect livestock and cattle in this Nation. The budget for the Department for 1958 calls for the expenditure of the same amount. Are we neglecting the children of this Nation while looking after the cattle?

I believe the amendment of the gentleman from California should be voted down. This item will not upset the budget or materially affect the continuing economy program.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I rise in defense of the rural library services program. Coming from one of the largest rural districts in the United States, I know what this program means to the people of the little towns, the crossroads, and the farms of this country.

This is essentially a program for children, for underprivileged children, those who have been deprived of the sustenance of the minds—books.

Last year Congress in its wisdom passed the bill making it possible to bring mobile library services to those vast sections of the rural population that had heretofore not had access to library books. This is a program in which the various States participate. It is carried out on the local level. It is meeting with an enthusiastic response among the people of the country. We have promised this help. We have a real obligation to uphold our part of the bargain by providing the funds in this bill to cover our share of the costs.

It has been my observation that the children of the rural areas, with less distractions and less social pressures, are in the greatest need of books. What new worlds will be opened up to the thousands of children in my own district by the books that this program will bring to them? How can we measure in dollars the insight, the inspiration, the ideals that one good book will bring to a knowledge-hungry child? What better cure for juvenile delinquency? What better antidote to mental disease than a diet of good books?

This program is sound. It is practical. It will bring books to those who want and need them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the overwhelming defeat of this amendment which would so seriously cripple the rural library program.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday we have the Consent Calendar.

Then there are four suspensions.

H. R. 3819, to provide representation on the Judicial Conference of the United States.

H. R. 76, increased compensation to veterans for service-connected disabilities.

H. R. 71, pension payments banned to certain prisoners.

H. R. 53, the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I correctly understand that all four of these bills passed the last Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding. The gentleman refers to the veterans' bills?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am confident two of them did. I think 3 of them did, but I am pretty sure that 2 of them did.

Thereafter there will be the continuation under the 5-minute rule of the consideration of the appropriation bill relating to the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments. It is understood that if there are any roll-calls on Monday they will go over until Tuesday. The leadership on both sides has made an agreement to this effect.

If the consideration of the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments appropriation bill under the 5-minute rule is not completed on Monday, it will continue on Tuesday.

On Tuesday and for the remainder of the week, after the disposition of that appropriation bill, the next order of business will be the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, H. R. 6500, and also the following bills:

H. R. 2146, the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

H. R. 4136, the extension of the Export-Import Bank Act.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 2, 1957
For actions of April 1, 1957
85th-1st, No. 56

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....2	Insect control.....1	Small business.....9,18
Adjournment.....26	Inventions.....6	Statehood.....20,35
Air pollution.....37	Labor, farm.....23	Stockpiling.....2,17
Appropriations.....5,27	Lands.....21,38,39	Student exchange.....10
Budget.....5,11,25,27	Legislative program.....25	Surplus disposal.....10
Coconut oil.....33	Loans, farm.....3	Surplus property.....34
Cotton.....2,31	housing.....41	Taxation.....27
Drought relief.....15	Monopolies.....8,13	Territories.....20
Electrification.....12	Plant pests.....1	Tobacco.....29
Expenditures.....30	Postal service.....40	Trade, foreign.....10
Farm program.....31,32	Poultry.....24	Transportation.....19
Flood control.....15,16	Price supports.....2	Textiles.....22
Food processing.....8	Public Law 480.....10	Veterans.....7
Foreign aid.....30	Reclamation.....16	Water resources.....14,15
Forestry.....21,39	Research.....32	Watershed.....36
Humane slaughter.....38	Reorganization.....4	Weather.....37

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to extend Public Law 480. Senate committee reported corn bill. House committee reported plant pests control bill. House passed bill to extend FHA loans to desertland entrymen. House subcommittee ordered reported bill to revise price support for upland cotton, increase acreage allotments for cotton, extend 1956 price supports for extra long staple cotton, and sell long staple cotton from stockpile. Both Houses received President's recommendation to continue Reorganization Act. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. INSECT CONTROL. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 3476, to facilitate the regulation, control, and eradication of plant pests (H. Rept. 289). p. 4422
2. COTTON. The Cotton Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee ordered reported to the full committee the following bills: (p. D269)
 - H.R. 3654, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to continue the price support for extra long staple cotton at the 1956 rate;
 - H. J. Res. 172, providing for the withdrawal and transfer of 50,000 bales of domestically grown extra long staple cotton from the critical stockpile to CCC for sale;
 - H.R. 5734, to increase the 1957 acreage allotments for cotton by 154,321 bales;
 - H.R. 2461, providing that the level of price support for upland cotton shall be determined on the basis of the parity price for upland cotton as of June 1 prior to the beginning of the marketing year, and the supply percentage for upland cotton as of the beginning of the marketing year shall be finally determined between June 1 and June 15, inclusive.

3. FARM LOANS. Passed without amendment H.R. 3988, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide more flexibility in refinancing loans by permitting the inclusion of personal property in determining eligibility for refinancing loans. pp. 4354-55
Passed over, at the request of Rep. Marshall, H.R. 3753, to enable this Department to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen. p. 4355
4. REORGANIZATION PLANS. Both Houses received a message from the President recommending the enactment of legislation to extend for 4 years the period within which the President is authorized to prepare and transmit to Congress plans for the reorganization of executive agencies (H. Doc. 145); to Government Operations Committees. pp. 4297, 4353
5. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 4388-4413, 4414
Rep. Byrd called for a reduction in the Federal budget and inserted a speech on the matter. pp. 4419-21
6. INVENTIONS. Passed over, on objections by Reps. Schenck, Cunningham, and Wright, H.R. 103, to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contributions relating to the national defense. p. 4353
7. VETERANS. Passed, under suspension of the rules, H.R. 53, to consolidate into one act, and to simplify and make more uniform, the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. pp. 4357-86
8. MONOPOLIES. Rep. Patman spoke in favor of H.R. 11, providing for the submission of burden of proof in price-discrimination cases under the Robinson-Patman Act, and cited the support of small food processors, canners, and small dairy processors for the bill. pp. 4417-19
9. SMALL BUSINESS. Received from the Small Business Admin. a proposed bill to establish that agency on a permanent basis; to Banking and Currency Committee. p. 4422

SENATE

10. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS DISPOSAL. Passed without amendment S. 1314, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) one year, to increase the authorization under Title I from \$3 billion to \$4 billion, to authorize \$300 million additional under Title II for famine relief, and to delete the restrictions on barter with Communist-dominated nations. Defeated, by a 23-54 vote (p. 4345), an amendment by Sen. Knowland to strike the section deleting the restrictions on barter with Communist-dominated states. Sen. Ellender discussed the uses of Public Law 480 funds, and inserted the fifth semi-annual report on the operations of the program and charts concerning the shipment of goods to various countries, and urged restrictions on all types of foreign aid (pp. 4326-32). Sen. Thye urged the value of the student exchange program (pp. 4331-2). Sens. Ellender, Aiken, and Johnston discussed the proposed repeal of the restrictions on barter with Communist nations and inserted Assistant Secretary Butz's report of Mar. 26 on this deletion (pp. 4332-4). Sen. Knowland urged adoption of his amendment to prevent the use of our surplus to support Soviet satellites, and inserted a Soviet resolution proposed to the General Assembly of the UN, criticizing the U. S. for "subversive activities" in other States (pp. 4334-9).

the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion are eligible for pension based on permanent and total non-service-connected disability. Pension is payable to any such veteran who served in the active military or naval service for a period of 90 days or more during such wars and who was discharged therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for disability incurred in service in line of duty. The veteran must have been in active service before the cessation of hostilities and be suffering from non-service-connected permanent and total disability not incurred as a result of his own willful misconduct or vicious habits. The rate of \$66.15 per month, except that where the veteran shall have been rated permanent and total and has been in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled, the rate is \$78.75 per month. A rate of \$135.45 per month is authorized in the case of an otherwise eligible veteran who is, on account of age or physical or mental disability helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person. Such pension is not payable to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds \$1,400 or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds \$2,700. Any person who served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, is also eligible for pension under part III as provided in the act of May 11, 1951—Public Law 28, 82d Congress.

In the administration of the aforementioned provisions the determination of permanent total disability is made on a very liberal basis. Such a rating is granted (where the requirement of permanence is met) when there is a single disability of 60 percent or 2 or more disabilities, 1 of which is 40 percent in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent, and unemployability attributed thereto. Although age alone is not considered as a basis for entitlement to such pension, it is considered in association with disability and unemployability in determining permanent and total disability. The aforementioned percentage requirements are reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60-percent rating for 1 or more disabilities, with no percentage requirement for any 1 disability; at age 60 to a 50-percent rating for 1 or more disabilities; and at age 65 to 1 disability ratable at 10 percent or more. When these reduced percentage requirements are met and the disability or disabilities involved are of a permanent nature, a permanent and total disability rating will be assigned, if the veteran is determined to be unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment by reason of such disability.

Widows are entitled to non-service-connected death pension based on their husband's war or comparable service,

with various marriage and other requirements specified in the laws.

It has come to the attention of the committee, based on a survey—in the 84th Congress—made of 10 States—Tennessee, Ohio, Colorado, California, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, and Georgia—as well as the Federal penal institutions, that there are a number of veterans, and some widows, now incarcerated in penal institutions who are drawing pension, compensation, or retirement pay.

The committee is of the opinion that there is no valid basis why a man should receive a pension for non-service-connected disability or age while he is incarcerated in a penal institution for a crime of which he has been convicted. In the case of compensation for a service-connected disability the committee is of the opinion that that is an entirely different benefit, based on disability, and to deprive a man of his service-connected compensation would be imposing an additional penalty. The same is true of retirement pay which is paid on an entirely different basis from pension.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the Administrator may apportion and pay to the wife and children of a veteran the pension which such veteran would be eligible to receive if he had not been incarcerated in a penal institution. Provision is also made for paying to a child or children, where the widow is disqualified by imprisonment, the pension which would be payable if there were no widow. Similarly, in the case of a disqualified child, the widow would receive a reduced pension.

The period of 60 days was set as it is believed that most sentences for minor offenses would be below this length of imprisonment.

While there would be some additional administrative burden placed upon the Veterans' Administration as a result of the enactment of this legislation, it does appear that there will be savings rather than any additional cost and in any event the committee is of the opinion that sound public policy requires no pension for a non-service-connected disability or age be paid to a person who is serving a sentence for the conviction of a felony or misdemeanor.

The committee's investigation revealed that veterans in Federal and 10 States' penal institutions had been convicted of various felonies and misdemeanors, including automobile theft, impersonating Federal employee, narcotic sale, forgery, bank robbery, rape, false claims, altering Government check, murder, counterfeiting, white slavery, tax evasion, firearms, unlawful possession, liquor-law violation, false statement, burglary, larceny, fraud, assault, obscene literature, mailing, conspiracy, distilling—illegal, probation violation, drunk and disorderly conduct, manslaughter, sodomy, arson, carnal abuse of child, incest, bigamy, abandonment of children, abortion, check, worthless passing, kidnaping, rioting, adultery, driving while drunk, vagrancy, stolen property receiving, confidence game, nonsupport of dependents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SHUFORD].

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical to H. R. 10477 which passed the House of Representatives in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, but failed of enactment in the Senate.

It provides that any veteran incarcerated for longer than 60 days, upon the conviction of either a felony or misdemeanor, shall not be entitled, for the period beginning on the 61st day of imprisonment, to a pension for non-service-connected disability. During such period, if the veteran has a wife or children, the pension for which he would otherwise be eligible, may be apportioned among them. Upon his release from prison, assuming he meets other qualifications, he could have his pension reinstated.

This legislation is based on a survey conducted by the committee in the 84th Congress which involved 10 States and the entire Federal penal system. It showed rather conclusively that a large number of veterans were incarcerated who were receiving pensions during their terms of imprisonment.

One of the most striking cases occurred in the State of New Mexico where a widow of one veteran was receiving pension based upon the service of her first husband, while she was serving a period of imprisonment for the murder of her second.

Another case called to the attention of the committee recently was of an individual who was guilty of assault and sentenced to several years imprisonment who had never received a pension, but who applied for a pension at the time he entered the prison and was granted it.

In the judgment of the committee, this sort of practice should be stopped and the enactment of this legislation would accomplish that purpose. It would result in a net saving to the taxpayers, while admittedly, there would be some additional cost of administration.

It is approved by the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office. The four major veteran organizations have indicated their support of the proposal.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUFORD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inquire of the gentleman if this would affect American servicemen who have been convicted by civil courts abroad? I know of a few instances where soldiers from West Virginia are serving as much as 5 years under sentences by Japanese courts. Would this deprive them of pensions?

Mr. SHUFORD. No, it would not apply in such cases.

Mr. BAILEY. Would not those gentlemen be entitled to pensions?

Mr. SHUFORD. Under this legislation they would not be deprived of any pension to which they were entitled.

Mr. BAILEY. There is no bar when they are released from the Japanese prisons?

Mr. SHUFORD. That is correct. Let me read from the bill:

That no pension under public or private laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be paid to or for an individual who has been imprisoned in a Federal, State, or local penal institution as the result of conviction of a felony or misdemeanor for any part of the period beginning 61 days after his imprisonment begins and ending when his imprisonment ends.

The pension begins again when his imprisonment ends. The bill provides that the widow or children would be entitled to the pension as provided in the bill while he is in prison if his incarceration is over 60 days. We think this is a good thing, and the Veterans' Administration also thinks so.

If the gentleman will permit me to read it, I have here a statement from the American Legion:

Yet another Teague bill (H. R. 71) proposes to suspend benefit payments to vets who are incarcerated for a misdemeanor or felony, payment to cease after 60 days imprisonment, and remain suspended until release. . . . Provisions are written into protect wives and children. . . . The bill would dignify the vets benefit program, and the 60-day clause prevents hardship on persons convicted for short terms for deeds that are more infractious and criminal in nature.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the bill in the committee las year and against the bill in committee this year. I think I was the only one who voted against it. I was very much in the minority. I dislike intensely to take away from veterans benefits arising from services they have performed and which they have earned.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the views expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina. This legislation would provide that when persons who are drawing pensions are incarcerated for periods of more than 60 days after conviction of a misdemeanor or a felony, they lose their pension until they are given their freedom again. It does not apply to compensation payments. In addition to that there are other provisions in the bill which permit their pensions to go to the wives and children, if such exist. I think, therefore, this law is a step in the direction of protecting these dependents of veterans and, perhaps, assuring them of a more reliable income than they would have under the present law. I see no reason why one who is in prison and is already a charge upon the State should receive further benefits. To that extent, the legislation will effect an economy. For those reasons, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Addonizio	Ford	Multer, N. Y.
Alexander	Frazier	Norrell
Alger	Frelinghuysen	Osmer
Anderson, Mont.	Fulton	Pfost
Anfuso	Garmatz	Philbin
Aspinall	Gary	Powell
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Preston
Bass, N. H.	Gregory	Prouty
Bowler	Griffiths	Reece, Tenn.
Breeding	Hardy	Robeson, Va.
Burleson	Haskell	Rodino
Chelf	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Tex.
Chenoweth	Healey	Santangelo
Chudoff	Hillings	Seely-Brown
Collier	Hollfield	Sheehan
Coudert	Holland	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Holtzman	Stauffer
Dellay	Jackson	Teller
Dies	Kearney	Ullman
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Vanik
Dollinger	Kelly, N. Y.	Vors
Durham	Lennon	Vursell
Eberharter	McConnell	Westland
Elliott	Macdonald	Willis
Evins	Mack, Wash.	Wilson, Calif.
Fallon	Metcalf	Yates
Farbstein	Morano	
Fino	Morgan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. On this rollcall 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further

consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 3, page 18, of the bill.

If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we had 4 days of debate on this bill last week. In that time we finished the Department of Labor and just got started on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where one amendment was adopted by just one vote and the other amendment was defeated by a substantial margin.

I just wanted to remind the House again that on last Tuesday or Wednesday your President and mine warned this House that the kind of cuts we have been making for the past week in this budget are fatuous and foolish. Then the Secretary of Labor, who is your Secretary of Labor and mine, issued, I thought, a very strong press release condemning the way that these cuts are being made. These have been piecemeal cuts and across the board cuts with really no justification behind them. Their only purpose appears to be to permit you to be able to say or brag in the next election that you were able to cut the President's budget.

Now I see the other part of the team working on this appropriation bill that we now have before us has commented on our action. There seem to be only 3 spokes in this wheel, the President, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I notice this morning that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is following in the same footsteps of the President and the Secretary of Labor. He, too, is warning the Congress about the kind of cuts that you have been offering and have been voting for the Department of Labor.

If I may, I shall quote from today's paper. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said:

Still further major reductions simply would retard the progress of the American people toward better health, improved education and greater economic security.

In other words, some of the amendments that you are going to offer this afternoon and tomorrow and maybe the next day are going to impair the health of our people, they are going to deny proper educational facilities for our children; and they are putting in jeopardy the economic security of our country. The Secretary went on further to say that—

To neglect health, education, or economic security only piles up greater cost in the long run. It would be false economy, for example, to cut funds for public health and medical research when these activities held bright promise of greatly reducing the toll of disease and disability.

He maintained that the Department's programs over the years will yield far more than the cost, in preventing human

suffering, caring for human needs, and fostering economic growth.

He went on to condemn the amendment that you people offered and adopted last Thursday cutting the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration. And he was just as right as he could be when he condemned that cut, as we tried to point out on the floor. He also warned about further cuts in vocational rehabilitation and in education and in public health.

I hope that the membership of this committee and of this House will pay some attention to your President, to your Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to the Secretary of Labor. Certainly they have never been charged by anybody on this side or your side of the aisle to be leftwingers or ultraliberals. Neither have they been accused of wanting to spend every dime that they could lay their hands on. They have the name of being conservative and yet in this instance they want to do what is best for the people of our country. When you continue to offer amendments and to vote for the type of cuts that you made last week in this bill, you are certainly taking away some of the rights and privileges of these people. And as was expressed in an article yesterday by one of the President's economic advisers, Mr. Hauge, if you really want to cut this bill, why don't you do it the right way? Why don't you come in and propose legislation that will repeal existing laws that have our hands tied now as far as appropriating funds and matching grants to States and educational and medical research facilities are concerned. I personally believe they are doing some good for the people of our country but if you don't agree with me why don't you stand and honestly propose the repeal of those laws?

I do not believe it is right to get up and speak for and vote for all of these changes in law that you have made in the last 3 or 4 years and then come in today and cut, as I have said before on 2 or 3 occasions, the guts out of these appropriation bills. In that way you make it impossible to operate them efficiently and you are in effect saying, "Well, I do not want to approach it through the front door, but this is the best I can do. Maybe if we can embarrass the Department and not give them sufficient money they will not be able to operate."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the chairman. He is relying for sustaining his position on this bill, as he did all last week, not on the merits of the amounts contained in the bill but upon politics and what effect it was going to have on this Member or that Member for the way he voted. Maybe that is the thing to do, but for my own part I have discussed nothing but what was the right thing to do. I have discussed nothing but what I believe would help these different agencies by preventing them from building up such an enormous load of personnel that they would not be able to do a good job.

Now, here it is. From this point on in the bill, just as I have in the past all the way through, I shall vote for that figure which I believe best will serve the interests of the people of the United States, and not vote a certain way because somebody else says that should be done. Frankly, I think the judgment of the Members of the House on this bill, their own deliberate judgment, is the best key to what these people need in the departmental agencies. I think this House must realize that we have to keep down the number of personnel to a point where these people can work efficiently and effectively and in the interests of the people of the United States. I hope the Congress will go on through to the end with that thought in mind.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the policy and the statement made by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, the able chairman of the subcommittee and to commend him on the able, effective way in which he has carried forward this battle for the people, and the forward-looking way in which he is calling the attention of this House to the problems of our people.

It has been said that perhaps we should not listen to what the President or the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or any other high-level governmental official may say. I say we cannot avoid looking at the realities as portrayed by the facts of the situation. Merely to talk about a budget and say it is a big budget or to try to prove it is too big or too small, either is meaningless unless you look at it in relation to two factors, and only then does it have any significance or meaning. Those two factors are merely these: No. 1, the population growth picture of the country, what it has been, is, and will be in the near future, and No. 2, the economic productivity as measured in terms of the gross national product, which is a measure of our ability.

The increases in the various categories of our population, the young, the middle-aged, and the old, will indicate the needs of the people for services which they demand and to which they are entitled, as the President said. The gross national product is the measure of the ability to pay for a reasonable amount of those services.

The question of the size of the Federal budget has certainly generated more heat than light. While the argument centers around the question whether or not it is too big, the question whether it is big enough is lost sight of. Yes, I said whether it is big enough. Seventy-one billion eight hundred million dollars is a lot of money. But do you know that it represents only 17 percent of our gross national product? That this budget actually provides less per capita than the 1954 budget which was \$4 billion less? That this budget would place no greater burden on the economy than any budget in the last 6 years? This is true simply because of our explosive population. We are literally growing by leaps and bounds.

Let us go quickly into the population picture. A fact that I think is too far either overlooked or underestimated is that in 1940, 17 years ago, we had 131 million people in America. It took 320 years of slow, steady growth to reach 131 million, from 1620, the time of the landing of the Pilgrims, until 1940. What did that census clock in the Department of Commerce Building tick off last month? One hundred and seventy million, an increase of 39 million people in the last 17 years since 1940.

They can project those figures with reasonable accuracy and within a reasonable margin. By 1975 we shall have anywhere from 222 million to 228 million people, an increase of 52 million in the next 17 years. We have already seen 17 of those 35 years, or half of that time pass since 1940. We stand today at the midmark. There are 17 years ahead of us until 1975. Let us look ahead for at least 10 years or 5 years, if not for 17 years, and let us not merely look backward toward last year's budget. Let us abandon this constant reference to a year ago, comparing this budget to what was appropriated a year ago. I will say there has been some progress made, as far as many of our conservative colleagues are concerned. Our friends on the other side of the aisle not long ago were looking back 20 or 30 years ago, trying to keep Government participation at that level. Let us go ahead, however, now on the basis of these 35 years from 1940 to 1975. In this period we will have an increase in our population which is 70 percent of the total increase of our population that took 320 years to achieve. What does that mean? Where is this increase taking place? Over 97 percent of this increase has taken place in our metropolitan areas and only 3 percent has taken place in the nonmetropolitan areas. It means congestion. It means more housing. It means more demands for vocational training. It means more hospitalization and more disease and more illness in children and more problems with reference to the aged. It means more traffic facilities. Even now it is beginning to affect such a simple thing as water, which I shall touch on just briefly in a moment. Fifty-seven percent of all people are now living in 173 metropolitan areas, which is only 7 percent of our total land area. That means problems brought about by this explosive increase in our population growth. What are the implications of this rapid growth? Let me give you a few examples. Number one—water. That is a simple thing. We never thought we would run out of water.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the Chairman and I thank my colleagues for their indulgence.

So far as water is concerned, today with twice the population that we had in 1900, we are using four times as much water per capita. Not only are more

people using water, but we are using more water per capita. We are using four times as much water per capita. Industry is using 10 times the water that it used in 1900. Most of that increase has taken place in the last 17 years since 1940, and they are going to double their use of water in the next 17 years. Within 10 years, water will become a national problem and perhaps a crisis.

Consider the question of education. Already our educational plant is completely inadequate. The classroom shortage deprives 1 million boys and girls each year of full-time schooling and adequate educational opportunities. Millions more attend classes of 40 or more. As Secretary Folsom says, and I may say to my economy-minded friends across the aisle, "He is your Secretary, you put him in a position of importance."

These children are not imaginary. They are in school today and they can be counted with reasonable accuracy.

Over 2 million of these real children the Secretary was talking about exceed normal school capacity. The problem of inadequate educational facilities will not disappear by pretending that it is last year. As a matter of fact, it will continue to worsen. We have 12 million children under 3 years of age and there are going to be 5½ million babies born each year 10 years from now. The present classroom shortage will seem minor a few years from now unless we begin doing something about it, and doing it now.

College enrollments will double in the next 10 years. We will have 8 million to 10 million students between the ages of 18 and 25 in our colleges and universities. That means we will have to double the facilities or build an amount equal to that built in the last 300 years. This will all have to be done in the next 10 to 15 years.

For years we have watched while the number of the Nation's older folks increased yet today we find ourselves totally unprepared to cope with the problem. About 8½ percent of our population—14 million people—are over 65 years of age. By 1960 the number is expected to be almost 16 million. Our senior citizens must have satisfactory incomes and living standards. Simple justice dictates that. Yet while the Nation's population aged 65 and older increased 17 percent from 1947 to 1952, for instance, their share of total personal income did not increase at all. Today the average person over 65 has an income of less than \$1,000 and 1 of 4 of them has no income at all. We simply have not kept faith with the Nation's senior citizens on our present budget. Are they too to be sacrificed on the altar of economy for the sake of economy? Or will we face up to our responsibilities and modernize our old age security programs to meet today's problems?

The health of the Nation, while improving, is still inadequate. Research of all sorts into these problems is critically needed yet there are those on this floor who would cut the funds required to carry out such research. In mental health for instance, much research is needed if we are to begin to solve this

tragic problem which afflicts so many people. Over 50 percent of all the hospital beds in the Nation are taken up by individuals suffering from some sort of mental illness. Does anyone think that this problem of mental illness will subside in the near future? Do you think there is going to be less disease of all types?

If some of the Members on the other side of the aisle are really interested in saving money maybe these figures would be of interest to them: Because of ill health we lose between 4 and 5 million man-years of work and more than \$38 billion of national wealth each year. Expanded research programs into some of the more serious of these killer diseases such as heart trouble, cancer, arthritis, mental health, and others would, in the long run, save us money. But this takes money—not how much we spent last year but enough to take care of the problem as it exists this year and as it will grow in the years to come because of increased population.

Look at what happened in the field of automobile transportation and traffic. We are killing more men, women, and children—civilians on our highways, roads, and streets of America in the last 12 months than were killed in 30 months of the tragic war in Korea a few years ago. Forty thousand three hundred people were killed on the highways and streets of America in the last 12 months. We need modern highways to stop this killing. So I urge you to look at this appropriation with tomorrow, not yesterday, in mind. We are not going to be able to hold the line, as has been said, because the demands and needs of an ever-increasing population will be too great. We have to be more realistic about it. We have to look ahead to see what the times are going to be and act accordingly. These are the realities of the situation and they must be considered in a realistic budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has expired.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know we are all very, very conscious of the effect of statistics. If we study them we can interpret them in various ways. We have just had a very able argument by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. I do not have any desire to refute the statements he made, when they are based upon statistics. However, I suggest that they might be interpreted in a very different way. The hard facts of the matter are that in 1940 we had a population of 131 million. In 1958, at the time this budget becomes effective, we will probably have a population of 171 million, 40 million increase. That figures 31 percent increase in population.

Now, what about the budget of 1940? Nine billion dollars. What about the requested budget for 1958? Seventy-two billion dollars; an increase of nearly 800 percent in requested appropriations.

Now, it would not be fair not to put that back in terms of the purchasing power of the dollar in 1940. Let us say

we can cut 50 percent in purchasing power of the dollar. It is still a 400-percent increase. A 31-percent increase in population and a 400-percent increase in requested budget. Those figures are hard to argue against, even with this tremendous defense effort. Even with the tremendous defense effort can you justify that increase? I doubt it. I believe we should look these facts in the face and analyze some of these statements that are made, and get down to brass tacks.

We know very well the most effective factor in inflation is Federal spending. If we can cut this Federal spending to reasonable, but still very great size, say to this current year or last year, we can save six or seven thousand million dollars. If we can apply that on the Federal debt, your so-called tight money situation vanishes into thin air.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, today's issue of the Washington Star, just off the press, carried the headline in boxcar letters: "United States payroll hits a billion dollars monthly." Under it is the statement that "the Federal payroll in January hit an all-time peak of \$1 billion a month."

And supplementing that is the announcement that "This was the highest monthly Federal civilian payroll of all times" and

"This total was reported despite a decrease in employment which occurred during the same month."

When the bill passes, if it passes in its present form, this statement will be obsolete because the bill carries for HEW alone 1,086 additional employees. The entire bill increases the number of civilian employees something like 1,300 and the total budget this year if enacted as submitted would add additional Federal employees in the number of 29,472 over June 1957, and 75,945 over June 1956.

The January payroll is not only the highest in history but under the pending budget and the pending bill it is increasing at an astonishing rate, and of course taxes must keep pace with the increase.

I was much intrigued by the preliminary remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. The editorial on which he based his remarks stated that expenditures provided in this bill were a bright promise. That is the trouble, we have been regaled with such promises too often unfulfilled.

The one thing we should keep in mind is the fact that these appropriation bills affect the cost of living of every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Due to excessive appropriations, the breakfast served this morning on the table of every family in America cost twice as much as it cost a comparatively short time ago. Because we have been spending money we did not have for things we could get along without, the cost of living has climbed steadily. And because we continue to pile up the national debt and maintain wartime taxes the statistical bureaus of the Departments of the Government report that the cost of living has continued to increase over the years and has increased over the

previous month for the last eight successive months. The cost of food and clothing and shelter and family maintenance was higher last month than the month before; it is higher this month than it was last, and it will be higher next month than it is this month. Yet we keep on spending money and more money for things we could get along without. Unless we stop buying the things we can get along without we can expect to have to pay more and more for the things we can not get along without.

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we listened last week and this morning, and I have read in the newspapers, the agonizing cries about cutting this bill. I want to remind the House that you have not cut \$1 below what they are living on now. All we are asking them to do is to buckle their belts just 1 notch tighter and live this year within the same budget they lived on last year. We are asking, in response to the demand of the American people, that this budget be cut. If you cut this budget back to what it was last year you will have accomplished a great object. I do not think you will succeed in doing it on this bill because you are not cutting everything back to what it was last year.

There is a lot of talk about cuts, but we have not been cutting. I would like to remind you of a few figures about employment. In this particular bill, do you realize this department is asking for an increase of 5,548 new employees for the coming year? The argument is made, "well, you are going to hurt some poor person who will not get this piece of charity that we have proclaimed in some bill for an authorization." But 5,548 new employees means a lot of money and that is what this bill calls for. And does not help one poor person or one sick person.

You might as well be reminded of the previous rate of increased employment in this ever-growing bureau. The figures for 1956 were 54,341, in 1957 there were 58,153 and this year the present bill provides money for an increase to 63,701 employees.

It has been said that this bill has been cut by \$114 million. Do you know where that cut is? Sixty-six million, eight hundred thousand dollars of that cut is a reduction in school construction in impacted areas. It was reduced because, apparently, they did not have a call for it, they have constructed the schools. That is \$66 million they did not ask for this year. Then there is veterans' unemployment compensation in which the demands have been declining constantly. The budget cut that \$33 million. So \$100 million of that \$114 million as shown in the report involves cuts in things that were not needed any more.

I hope that the Members of the House in voting on these things will remember that we are not seeking to cut below last year. We are asking them only to live within their present budget.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mrs. BLITCH. Is it not true that if we do not cut down the administrative expenses of these programs we are going to be forced to deprive the people for which these programs were established in the first place of the full benefit of them?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think so and I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. Chairman, we have been confronted with a lot of threats here in the last few days, that we are going to have a rollcall on all of these amendments. I hope you will have a rollcall on all of them. Personally, I think I have voted for all the cuts and I would welcome the opportunity to put myself on record for what the American people are demanding and that is that we reduce expenditures so that they may get some relief from the present terrific burden of taxes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that worries me about the discussion of the bill thus far is that whenever any of us undertake to show some interest in economical administration and offer amendments to cut down on the growing bureaucracy, other members of this Committee accuse us of being opposed to better health, better education and better living conditions for the American people.

The other day one member of the Committee compared those of us who are trying to make reductions in this bill to people who would take money out of a cup held by a blind man. Another member last Friday delivered a speech here in the well in which he quoted St. Paul's statement that charity is the greatest virtue. Now, I do not profess to be a great Bible student, but I do not believe the gentleman can find any place in the Bible where St. Paul or anybody else encouraged a trustee to be charitable with somebody else's money.

It is very well to be charitable with our own money, and I try to be as liberal as possible with my own, but we are trustees of the tax money we extract from the American people, and it is our responsibility, in my judgment, to see that that money is wisely expended.

Now, let me give you a little illustration of what I have in mind. We have a very fine program called assistance to States, general. It is administered by the Public Health Service. I invite your attention to pages 429 and 430 of

the hearings. There is an interesting table on page 430. Now, if an amendment is offered to cut some of the approximately \$19 million that the committee allowed to run this particular program next year, the charge will be made, as it has already been made, that the people who offer and support the amendment are not willing for the American people to have good health; that they are so coldhearted that they have no sympathy with people who are unfortunate enough not to have good health. But, I call your attention to this fact. The table on page 430 shows that requests were made this year for \$24,609,000 to operate that program, but I also call your attention to the fact that only \$18.5 million of that money was to go for health assistance to the States. In other words, they were asking for \$6 million to pay the overhead costs to distribute \$18 million to the States. To put this another way, we take from the States in the first place the entire \$24 million and then we are asked to spend \$6 million on salaries and overhead expenses in order to give \$18 million back to the very people from whom we extracted the \$24 million in the first place.

Now, let me call your attention to some of the increases they requested. Last year they had \$3.5 million for personnel. They wanted to increase that by half a million dollars to \$4.1 million. Last year they spent \$282,550 in this program for travel. They wanted to increase that to \$364,450 for travel; not for health, not for better health, but for travel. They wanted to increase their communications budget from \$173,100 to \$178,900. They wanted to increase their printing bill. They wanted to increase their bill for supplies and equipment. And, of course, they had the mandatory increase of \$200,000 for Civil Service retirement.

Now, I do not criticize the committee for its action in this case because the committee reduced those requests by \$5 million. They increased some of the grants by \$2 million. Those of us who are trying to bring about some economy are trying generally to reduce spending to 1957 levels and not, as has been implied, to cripple, emasculate or destroy programs providing health benefits. We think economies can be practiced in many areas, and we believe it is the duty of this committee to point out the way. But these efforts do not deserve to be called attempts to scuttle the health programs. I for one reject that charge as wholly unfounded.

Following is the table to which I referred. It is taken from page 430 of the hearings:

Assistance to States, general, obligations by objects

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Total number of permanent positions.....	574	612	733
Full-time equivalent of all other positions.....	12	6	8
Average number of all employees.....	521	574	669
Number of employees at end of year.....	545	601	700
Average salaries and grades:			
General schedule grades:			
Average salary.....	\$4,959	\$5,049	\$5,148
Average grade.....	GS-6.2	GS-6.4	GS-6.7

Assistance to States, general, obligations by objects—Continued

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions.....	\$3,022,683	\$3,490,580	\$4,108,900
Positions other than permanent.....	67,395	30,100	44,500
Regular pay above 52-week base.....	9,787	-----	16,100
Payment above basic rates.....	34,349	11,900	12,400
Total personal services.....	3,134,214	3,532,580	4,181,900
02 Travel.....	253,861	282,550	364,450
03 Transportation of things.....	20,993	30,700	47,700
04 Communication services.....	177,160	173,100	178,900
05 Rents and utility services.....	87,597	71,200	71,200
06 Printing and reproduction.....	90,469	84,900	104,700
07 Other contractual services.....	123,286	178,470	592,450
Services performed by other agencies.....	14,657	12,900	12,900
Purchase of vital records transcripts.....	163,000	163,000	163,000
08 Supplies and materials.....	53,985	55,700	96,200
09 Equipment.....	41,892	43,700	72,100
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	13,332,038	13,000,000	18,500,000
Contribution to retirement fund.....	-----	-----	200,600
13 Refunds, awards, and indemnities.....	3,400	2,800	3,200
15 Taxes and assessments.....	3,133	10,400	19,700
Total obligations.....	17,499,735	17,642,000	24,609,000

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me for just a moment to correct statements made by the gentleman who just left the floor?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, as I remember it, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] said that about six or eight million dollars of these grants to States was for administrative purposes. That is not so. Referring to the table the gentleman quoted from, you will see on the preceding page that in order to administer this \$20 million it is going to cost \$108,000 for administration, not six or eight million dollars as the gentleman said. There are items in there for technical assistance to States, almost \$2 million. There is another item for collecting and compiling vital statistics that amounts to \$1½ million and other assistance that the States have been asking for and which we have been supplying to them, and which certainly have helped these backward States no end in the last 7 or 8 years. It is these programs that make up way over 90 percent of the six or eight million dollars.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in the somewhat vociferous arguments that we have listened to for the past week on this appropriation bill covering the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, I cannot help but question the consistency of some of the gentlemen who have been leading the fight to make reductions. Some of them as small as \$10,000 or \$20,000 in some items.

I refer particularly to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SMITH] and the ranking Democrat on that committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. I should like to remind those gentlemen that some of the headaches with which we are met here today came about because of the action of the Committee on Rules in bringing legislation to the floor of the House under a gag rule, under which the House was not able to work its will. It has resulted in unnecessary and burden-

some appropriation items to carry the legislation into effect.

The latest one of those was the Midwest program of President Eisenhower, involving \$400 million. That was brought to the floor under a gag rule, so that the House could not work its will on it. I would like to remind the gentleman that that bill was modified somewhat in the other body and came back here with a provision that they had to come to Congress before they could use \$200 million of the \$400 million. But those are the things that are costly and those are the things that we want to get at. I think it is time we stopped bringing legislation involving appropriations to the floor of this House under gag rules.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to speak for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to an item on page 25 of the bill:

Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$50 million, to remain available only until June 30, 1959.

So that everybody understands my position, I intend to oppose any amendment that is offered to delete this item from the bill. For the benefit of my Republican colleagues who ran on the program of peace, progress, and prosperity, I should like to quote what the President stated in his state of the Union message. I am rather hesitant to bring this up at this time, but at the time the amendment will be presented to delete this appropriation I might not have the opportunity to call attention to this particular statement made by the President in his state of the Union message:

Our soil, water, mineral, forest, fish, and wildlife resources are being conserved and improved more effectively. Their conservation and development are vital to the present and future strength of the Nation. But they must not be the concern of the Federal Government alone. State and local entities, and private enterprise should be encouraged to participate in such projects.

I would like to make special mention of programs for making the best uses of water, rapidly becoming our most valuable natural

resource, just as it can be, when neglected, a destroyer of both life and wealth. There has been prepared and published a comprehensive water report developed by a Cabinet committee and relating to the various phases of this particular problem.

In the light of this report, there are two things I believe we should keep constantly in mind. The first is that each of our great river valleys should be considered as a whole. Piecemeal operations within each lesser drainage area can be self-defeating or, at the very least, needlessly expensive. The second is that the domestic and industrial demands for water grow far more rapidly than does our population.

The whole matter of making the best use of each drop of water from the moment it touches our soil until it reaches the oceans, for such purposes as irrigation, flood control, power production, and domestic and industrial uses clearly demands the closest kind of cooperation and partnership between municipalities, States, and the Federal Government. Through cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities in these vast projects we can obtain the economy and efficiency of development and operation that springs from a lively sense of local responsibility.

And until such partnership is established on a proper and logical basis of sharing authority, responsibility, and costs, our country will never have both the fully productive use of water that it so obviously needs and protection against disastrous flood.

If we fail in establishing and sustaining this partnership, all the many tasks that need to be done in America could be accomplished only at an excessive cost, by the growth of a stifling bureaucracy, and eventually with a dangerous degree of centralized control over our national life.

In all domestic matters, I believe that the people of the United States will expect of us effective action to remedy past failure in meeting critical needs.

When this amendment is offered to strike out this \$50 million, it would mean the finish of this whole program of cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities in an attempt to clean up the pollution that exists in our streams and waters throughout the Nation.

We are blessed with great natural resources, a God-given supply of water. The evidences of the devastation of pollutive conditions that exist on our streams throughout the Nation are on every hand. With the increased growth of our population, unless we in the Congress and the States and the municipalities manifest interest for the protection and conservation of our water so that we can build for the future, the pollution of our streams will continue. The existing conditions throughout the Nation must be corrected.

The attempt that will be made to strike out this \$50 million appropriation that is in this bill in my estimation is not good judgment. To me, clean streams, clean water, the health and sanitation of our people, particularly the great metropolitan areas, need our most careful attention and consideration. I sincerely hope the Members of the House will be alerted at the time this amendment is offered to take such action as in their judgment they see fit to take for the health welfare of the people of the Nation. As for me, I am an advocate of clean streams and the elimination of pollution and filth from our

waters. This is a program that should be continued and should have been undertaken many years ago in order that we may conserve and protect our waters for the growth and development of the Nation and be helpful to protect and conserve our waters for the generations that will follow.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about this "economy drive" which we have seen in operation here in the House during the last few days.

When we received this \$73.6-billion Budget from the President, which was the highest peacetime budget in the history of the United States, and when the Secretary of the Treasury made his well-publicized statement that this Budget should be cut, I am sure we all know there was a great wave of feeling throughout the country that it was incumbent upon the Congress to make a cut in this Budget.

I am a member of the subcommittee which dealt with this particular bill to provide funds for the Labor Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We approached their budgets on the theory and with the thought uppermost in our minds that we should cut them down in every case where it was possible to cut with genuine economy. We heard the evidence on this bill, and we took the testimony of official witnesses. I think that our Committee on Appropriations did an excellent job. We cut the appropriation \$119 million below the Department's requests, and \$19 million below the appropriation made last year.

Some people have said here that certain expenditure items were taken out of the bill only because certain programs had expired. But let me call your attention to the fact that certain items for additional expenditures had to go into the bill. There was the item providing for the extra day's pay to be paid during the next fiscal year. And there was another item added because of the new system of accounting by which the Government contribution for employees' retirement pay, instead of being handled as a single, separate appropriation, is to be paid from the appropriation for each individual Department into a general fund.

Then a very large increase in the appropriation now before us came about because of a mandatory increase in grants to States for public-assistance or welfare payments as a result of the action of Congress last year. I say that we cut this bill a very large sum, considering the limited leeway we had. I think our committee did an excellent job.

But, when this bill came to the floor, there were more amendments offered to this bill than to any bill that I have seen since I have been a Member of the Congress. And I imagine some of the Members who have been here for many, many years have never seen a drive against any bill such as the drive that has taken place

against this one, with amendment after amendment being offered to cut the appropriation recommended by the Appropriations Committee. We have been working here for 5 days on it and looks as if we are going to be here with it for a few days more.

We hear so much about the "economy" resulting from some of these cuts made on the House floor. I think our committee cut this bill to the bone. But I think the nature of the cuts our committee made will not impair the essential functions of our Government. When Congress passes a law setting up a program, you have to appropriate new money, if the program calls for it, to carry out that law. We who serve on the Committee on Appropriations have operated within those requirements and those limits, as is only proper.

I want to call your attention to the fact that the President of the United States said that the actions of the House of Representatives on this bill were "fatuous and futile." I turned on my television yesterday evening, and I heard the statement made by Mr. Mitchell, the Secretary of Labor, when he was asked about the cuts made in this appropriation bill. He said he did not agree with the cuts that the House Committee on Appropriations made, but he said the committee did act intelligently. He said they acted constructively. He said the committee acted in a way demonstrating that they knew what they were doing.

For instance, Secretary Mitchell said the Committee on Appropriations allowed money to permit the Department of Labor to try to help in finding jobs for persons over 45 years of age. He said the Committee on Appropriations allowed money so that veterans discharged from the military service would have someone to help them to find a civilian job. He said that the action here in the House took that help away from them. He said the action of the House took that money away from the Department so that they cannot carry on that program.

Then, in this morning's paper, the Washington Post, I read this statement made by a third member of the Eisenhower "team," the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Secretary Folsom is quoted as saying:

While I did not agree with the actions of the House Committee on Appropriations with respect to this budget, I know those actions were based on a thorough knowledge and a constructive approach to the problems in those fields and were taken only after weeks of hearings and careful deliberations.

He said, and I repeat:

I know these actions were based on a thorough knowledge and a constructive approach to the problems in those fields.

Thus he was saying in an implied way that that was not the case with the action by the House of Representatives.

This bill deals with matters affecting labor, health, education, and welfare. It is something in which everyone in the country is interested. The extreme nature of this drive that is being made now is apt to cause the pendulum of public sentiment to swing the other way, if my mail is any criterion.

For a good while after the President submitted his budget, I received mail day after day saying that we should cut the appropriations. But since this bill has come before the House, and met the treatment that it has here, I have received piles of letters and telegrams protesting against the proposed cuts and the cuts that have been made by the House.

I think we are going to an extreme. I think the Committee on Appropriations went down the middle of the road and offered the House a sound approach to economy. I am afraid the action the House is taking is not going to bring real economy in the long run and those who are pushing this "economy drive" here are just going to defeat the purposes of economy and their own object and their own ends.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that the two points of this economy drive be emphasized. One, of course, runs through most of these proposed cuts. That is the concern that many of us have, of how much money we can take out of the economy each year in a safe manner. That is the traditional base for economy moves. But there is also a very important second line of reasoning that is based upon another consideration. I am contemplating offering a series of amendments that will be based primarily upon this second basic reason. It is the question of what happens when we have the Federal Government come into these programs; whether or not that is the best way to accomplish results. That is not a question of how much money we are spending. It is a question of how we are spending the money. It is a question of whether we are spending that money wisely.

Now, I am taking on a burden that is really difficult to try to discuss objectively these Health Institute programs. To try to discuss what is the best way to go about combating cancer and heart disease, et cetera, which all of us are opposed to. We want to do everything we can to try to further those programs. It is a question of balance. Everyone knows that private industry is the main source of our advancement in those areas. It is true of education as well as of health. The Federal Government has a part to play, in my judgment, but it is a question of what part it is to play and how large a part. On these health programs, these are open-end authorizations. There is only one way in which we can decide how far the Government will go, and that is right here when these appropriation bills come up.

Here is an example of the damage that can be caused if we create an imbalance between private, Federal and local enterprises. For example, we dry up clinical material. In cancer research, through this centralization of research, which is essentially what we have in this Federal program, we are drying up clinical material that is available upon which to conduct research. Right now we have a situation where in cancer research most clinical material is available only through some Federal program. There

are many people in this research field who are deeply concerned about that aspect. Furthermore, too much centralization of research activity can be most damaging, because most new ideas come from heaven knows where, but they do not come from a centralized research program. Surely the Federal Government can afford assistance, but how far should that assistance go? There is an evil in passing out money to unqualified persons or unqualified ideas; when you have a lot of extra money—and we have got it—in these Federal programs, a lot of unqualified ideas and unqualified people can come in, to receive some of those funds. That does not help the program. It hurts it.

I might emphasize another point. Those who are concerned about our community chest drives know that we have not been able to get heart and cancer and certain other national health groups into our unified community chest drives. One reason I suggest is—it has not become dangerous yet but it may become dangerous—that if the heart and cancer drives, for example, do not meet their quotas in the local community, their directors can come to Washington and get Federal funds and make up the difference. That has already started. That can destroy the very base of our local and private programs in the health and welfare area.

So what I am pleading for is to talk about these things objectively. We are all trying to do our best to beat cancer and these dread diseases and remove them from our society. The issue is how far do we think it is reasonable for the Federal Government to go in the matter of assistance to get the best results? How far do we think the Federal program should be projected? There is a basic limit of trained research personnel in all these programs and in the thousand programs which the Federal Government has not yet touched.

I regret to say that the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations did not even touch these problems. There is no testimony on them; in fact from the hearings there seems to be a great ignorance on the part of the committee about these problems; but anybody who discusses the situation with the researchers and the persons involved in these overall struggles realize these are real and fundamental problems which must be studied and honestly discussed.

I would conclude by saying that those who consistently try to take the discussion off of an objective plane and place it in the area of emotionalism by doing so are biting the cause of the health, education, and welfare of our people.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, following along the lines of the statement just made by our colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] the House is to be commended for the sincere, nonpartisan way in which we have discussed this bill. Last week it was when our attention was called to a statement in a press

release by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McMORMACK]. At that time the report was that the President said something about an attempt to cut the budget being fatuous. Look that up. It means silly, stupid, foolish, inane, demented, imbecile, idiotic, illusionary, and several things more.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield and please tell us who said that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Naturally the gentleman well knows. The gentleman is just trying to kid me. If I may have 3 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Now will the gentleman tell the House who used the word "fatuous"?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is my understanding from the press that the President of the United States, your President and mine, used it with reference to those Members of the House who were attempting to cut the items in the pending bill. Am I correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly think the gentleman is correct. Must we be reminded of the fact that there were five on the gentleman's side of the aisle who were so reckless as to stand up and be counted with the President?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think there were five, maybe more. We are rather independent over here. And the gentleman may recall that the President said he did not want rubber-stamp Congressmen. It was two Democratic Presidents—Wilson and Roosevelt—who made that request which, by the way, the people denied. If the gentleman from New York will watch the vote when it comes on the foreign aid he will find there will be more Republicans in favor of cutting that item which some characterize as silly and useless than there will be on the gentleman's side. That is just my guess.

We over here on the Republican side prefer, if we are to waste money to do the wasting here in the United States rather than waste it abroad.

Now let me quote the statement of the majority leader:

I find no fault with what the President said. That is his right.

Under the fifth amendment—is not that right, the fifth amendment? And in fairness we on this side should exercise the same degree of independence, whatever may be said of our intelligence, just claim the same right to vote our convictions.

Let me read what the majority leader said:

One thing is certain, when a Democrat was President he at least had the majority of his own party supporting him, not by words "I like so and so."

My point is this, you know who opposed the Taft-Hartley law. It was the Democrats who furnished the votes to override Mr. Truman's veto of that bill.

Nonpolitical? Sure.

Let me quote a statement by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]:

I want to congratulate you now—

Talking about Republicans—

because the same combination that was working in that 80th Congress in 1947 and 1948 is again in effect yesterday and today and tomorrow. The same leaders are leading the same fight and I hope and pray that your success in cutting these appropriations will guarantee that a Democrat will be elected to the White House 4 years from now.

The gentleman, apparently, does not care about the appropriation. He does not say anything about the welfare of the country or the prosperity of the people. He does not say anything about peace. The hope of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] as he expressed it—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3046—is that the result of our action in cutting the budget now will be the election of a Democratic President, a worthy and desirable thing from their standpoint. But hardly the objective when an appropriation bill is being considered.

Some gentlemen on the Democratic side are very solicitous about the President. About his health. Permit me to speak as an expert. I have had some experience with speed laws in Hagerstown. It cost me \$10 to complete my education up there on that subject. That was on April first—all fools day—4 or 5 years ago. Four times recently on the front page of the Washington papers has been reference to the fact that the President when he went to Gettysburg was driven at a rate which exceeded the speed limit. The President was not driving. It is doubtful if he paid the slightest attention to the speed. As chief law enforcing officer of the United States, the President, of course, should obey all laws. But my interpretation of those articles is that the newspaper boys being caught back of a red light when the President's car went through on the green were a little sore because their car was just a little late at the intersection. And the officer just warned their lordships that there was a speed limit. It is my hope that the President will not let his driver do that any more. It is just too wearing on the reporters. The reporters are lucky to get to Gettysburg at all.

There is another gentleman on the other side who is also solicitous of the President's health. On March 12 he said:

If this resolution—

It was one to send the budget back to the President—

passes does the gentleman think that the President would make any recommendation to cut out the 2 helicopters it is proposed to park at the White House to carry the President and his friends out to Burning Tree Golf Course.

There has been no evidence before the House or its committee that I have read that such was the purpose. But what if that was the purpose.

We only have 1 President at this time. Some have been greatly worried about the health of the President—when he had

the heart attack and when he had that abdominal operation. Some were crying all over the place, cried enough to irrigate the whole Northwest. Some cried about the operation. Some worried about the President's cough. Then some come along with this little petty criticism about the speed of the car in which the President was riding, about anything the President may do. It is my hope the President is careful and does not wear a straw hat before the first day of official summer.

I can find as much fault with the President's legislative program as anyone on this floor. That is my privilege. But I do not intend to complain about anything that will contribute to his regaining his health. Nothing of that kind is coming from me. Nor is it my purpose to advise him to eat 1 or 2 eggs for breakfast, nor how to run his job. If the opposition thinks it important, let it go ahead and stick its political nose in the President's private life. We remember that gentleman who came from the great Northwest—the chairman will, I am sure—the gentleman who was honored to represent his State, who talked about the squirrels on the White House golf grounds? He came here and was fussing about the squirrels on the White House lawn.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to assure the gentleman that we are going to do everything we can to help defend the President's budget here today and the budget of his appointees from the Cabinet in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and we hope by so doing we may extend and add a few years to his life because we are hoping and praying that nothing will happen to him in the near future. I might also say he may help us a little more if he would give us a little in excess of 30 miles an hour support here on this appropriation bill. I think we would have better results. We are not asking for 40 or 50 miles an hour in support but just 30 miles an hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was that what the Democrats were doing when they tried to block consideration of this bill by passing House Resolution 190 and House Resolution 192 on rollcalls 17, 18, and 19? The Democrats who have a majority of at least 31 asked the President to tell them how to cut the bill. The President replied by telling the House it was our responsibility and that is just what some of us are trying to do. Mr. Chairman, listen to this:

Now, my good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY, moves that we yield to the Senate and put in the full amount of the Senate increase aggregating \$3 million above the President's request.

And let me say, my friends, I am going along with him. You know in a superheated, hysterically pressured atmosphere like this, nobody is going to vote against home and mother and free beer—nobody is going to vote in favor of cancer and heart disease. The answer to that is a foregone conclusion.

Those were the words that came from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. After we cut an appro-

priation bill it went over to the other body. It came back after conference where the Senate added \$3 million to it. Then when the bill was before us with the \$3 million added the gentleman who has charge of this bill went along. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said: "Nobody is going to vote against home and mother and free beer—nobody is going to vote in favor of cancer and heart disease." The whole trend of the debate on this bill seems to show an effort to brand those who favor a reduction which will hold appropriations carried in this bill to last year's appropriation as favoring cancer and heart disease as an attempt to oppress the worker. The result desired seems to be to place the party which has control here as the champion of economy while at the same time it poses as the champion spender. And with expressed hope it will win the next two elections by its doubletalk.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and to say that that statement is correct. That statement was made by the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations. But, I was very happy when the vote came, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, that I did not hear 3 voices raised in opposition to that motion to agree to the Senate amendments at the time it passed the House a year ago when we agreed not to go \$3 million above but \$50 million above the President's budget for research in cancer, heart, and mental health.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I wonder if the Chair could advise the House what amendment we are considering now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Tennessee that we are now discussing a pro forma amendment, and asking for the regular order will call for the Clerk to read.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I ask for the regular order, then, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that, please?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee insist on the regular order?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman wants the floor, I will withdraw my request.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the pro forma amendment a few minutes. I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly interested in the discussion and the debate on this bill. As the Members know, I served on the HEW Committee on Appropriations for 2 years with the able and distinguished gentleman—and I say that in all sincerity—JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, chairman of the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just wanted to say that the gentleman has served with great distinction on the committee. The advice and counsel that he rendered to those of us who were new at the time we were on the committee will never be forgotten, and I want to say that the gentleman was one of the greatest supporters of this program we ever had.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I was about to pay a compliment to the gentleman. I was about to say that no one holds the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], chairman of this subcommittee, in higher regard than do I, because I know that his heart is in the important job that he has to do for humanity. And, he has done a great service to suffering humanity.

Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly interested in the amendments that have been offered to this program, and I have voted for them. And, why did I do that? Because none of them applied to research into the cause and cure of dread diseases. I certainly would be the last one in America to do anything to act in any manner that would in any way, shape, or form deter the great progress that has been made in finding the cause and cure for these terrible diseases such as heart disease, cancer, mental illness, and so forth.

I am glad that no one has offered an amendment to reduce the amount requested by the committee for those items. A few days ago when the resolution was offered in the House asking the President to tell the Congress where appropriation items could be reduced below the budget, I said, speaking from this floor, that the acid test would come one of these days and then we would see whether or not the Members who supported that resolution were sincere. This is really the acid test. If a Member can vote for these amendments which have been offered to reduce this bill even though they do not apply to the dread human diseases in any way, shape, or form, then he has the intestinal fortitude to vote for almost any amendment to cut the budget that may be offered henceforth to any appropriation bills.

The gentleman from Missouri, our very able Chairman [Mr. CANNON], just talked about the number of civilians employed by the Government. He said there were more people employed in civilian positions today than ever before in the history of our country.

I just called the Byrd committee and talked to Haywood Bell, the executive clerk of that committee, and he gave me these figures.

In 1952 the high month was in June. There were 2,596,764 people employed. That year the 1953 fiscal year budget request was in the neighborhood of 2,700,000 people, which was at least 100,000 more than were on the payroll in that fiscal year, the fiscal year 1952.

The so-called Jensen rider was then adopted to five appropriation bills and the number of civilian personnel began to drop. On February 1 this year we had a total civilian personnel in the Government of 2,390,507. I think where the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] got his figures was for the month of December of last year when there

were over 340,000 temporary employees hired for a short time by the Post Office Department to handle the Christmas rush, which brought the figure up to a high of 2,741,000. The gentleman's figures, however, on dollars are correct. Never before in the history of this country has the cost for civilian employees amounted to a billion dollars a month. That is due to the fact that today the average employee receives higher wages.

This is the fifth appropriation bill on which the House has acted during this session, and in each bill the total personnel has been held very closely to the 1957 fiscal year figure. Had that not been the case I would have offered the so-called Jensen rider to those bills as I did in 1951 and 1952, just as I promised I would do if personnel requests in the bills were not held down. I will take a good look at the bills yet to be acted on.

Mr. Chairman, it is noteworthy that there are right now 1,172,214 civilians employed in the Department of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not want that much time. I was supposed to be at a committee meeting on Public Works at 2 o'clock and here it is 10 minutes after 2. I tried to get the floor before 2 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has refused additional time.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, I will take it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had just made the same request and I had refused, but since both of you insist I will take it.

Mr. ROONEY. I want the gentleman to understand we did not hear what was going on down there.

Mr. JENSEN. You did not hear?

Mr. CANNON. I regret that the gentleman is more generous to the gentleman from New York than to me, but we get the same result.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but since there is so much insistence I thought I would have to yield.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman will understand I got my statistics from the same source he cites.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say you are right, dollarwise and the amount is staggering to say the least. I will say and agree with the chairman. I simply want to keep the numbers straight too.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says I am right.

Mr. JENSEN. Dollarwise. This is because in 1952 the pay of Federal employees was approximately \$1,000 less per month on an average than it is today, so in that respect the gentleman was right; but as far as numbers are concerned, the gentleman's figures were not right.

Mr. CANNON. The figures are not mine. They are supplied by the source originally quoted by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U. S. C. ch. 13; 70 Stat. 909, 970-972), \$127 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such act.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 18, line 8, strike out "\$127 million" and insert "\$113,050,000."

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the item to which this amendment is offered is perhaps one of the most sacred of all the sacred cows we have to meet from time to time. The amendment I have offered reduces the amount for payments to school districts, impacted areas, from \$127 million to \$113,050,000. This is really not a reduction, it simply restores the figure of the 1957 budget.

The budget increase this year is \$13,950,000. In 1956 this appropriation amounted to \$85,523,000, in 1957, \$113,050,000, and the estimate for this year is \$127 million.

This relates to the impacted-area contribution, which I believe in continuing until we can find some way in which payments can be made in lieu of taxes to these impacted areas. Unfortunately, the need formula is not used. I think if we had a need formula it certainly would be legislation that would have merit and which I would support. But it seems to me that when we increase this amount by \$13,950,000 above what we had in 1957, we are simply opening the door for bigger and greater grants-in-aid.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues here in the committee, I believe one of the things this Congress should look into and give consideration to in the future is the great expansion and great growth of the grants-in-aid programs. I wonder if the Members of the House realize that today our grants-in-aid programs amount to over \$5 billion. Administration costs are very high. Most of these items are things which the States themselves could handle. If we would reduce the cost of government to the point where we could give some tax relief and turn these opportunities back to the States, we would have better government than we are having with these huge appropriations and large ad-

ministrative costs against all the taxpayers.

It has been said here that we are not interested in this because of the great increase in population. That these budgets should continue to follow the increase in population. May I point out to you that we now have a \$273 billion debt in this country. Along with health, education, and the other things provided for in this bill, we owe to those who are coming after us, to our children and our children's children something else. We owe them fiscal responsibility in government. We owe it to them to pass on to them a sound government and not a bankrupt government. So the mere fact that we are increasing in population is not an excuse to continue the increase of great budgetary expenses. It seems to me, our responsibility is to pass on a sound fiscal policy.

This amendment, as I say, will simply take us back to the 1957 level. This is not aimed at any particular school district or any particular area. I think you will recall that in the past few weeks there has been some very interesting controversy about certain school budgets, and we have been told by a very distinguished Member of this House that we should keep our nose out of the school affairs of other areas. At that time, I said if they would keep their hands out of the Federal Treasury we, perhaps, would not pay too much attention to their local school administration. I repeat that today. But, my colleagues, today is the day when nobody can raise any question about you putting your nose into the affairs of school districts. Today it is your responsibility and there is no infringement upon anybody's rights. This is, perhaps, the last time that you will have a chance to look at \$127 million. That is a lot of money. Let us put it back to the \$113 million figure. As I have said, I believe in helping in the impacted areas. I do not have any in my district, but I believe we must help those areas where there is an emergency and there is a need. But I do not believe the record has proven that there is a need. This is the best guess. Let me leave you with just this one thought: In this bill, we are talking of taking out 5,548 employees.

In other bills coming along, we are going to continue to try to take them out. This increase is based upon this budget. If we reduce substantially the number of Federal employees, then we reduce the need of this amount in this budget. When the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], speaks about the billion-dollar payroll—that is not all, I say to my colleague. It is not just what we pay in salaries. But, there is another \$127 million brought about because of the large employment of Federal employees throughout the country. If we are going to reduce this budget, and if we mean to do what we say we are going to do and cut down the personnel, then we will not need this large amount which has been estimated by this Department, and we can get along with what was provided in 1957. If it is not enough, we will be here. They have never hesitated to come back to us in the past and tell us when they needed additional funds.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a complete loss to understand the purpose of the gentleman from Ohio who obviously does not understand the objectives of the law which he is seeking to cut. Public Law 874 is for the maintenance and operation of school districts in areas under impact because of the employment of people on defense contracts and because of the proximity to military establishments.

The gentleman uses very loosely the term "grants-in-aid," when in fact this is not a grant-in-aid at all. It is simply an attempt by the Federal Government to make restitution to the school districts for the impact which the Government itself causes, and which would not exist if it were not for the fact that the Government has installations nearby.

This headlong rush that some of us seem to be in to economize is peculiar at this late date. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and as a member of the subcommittee which worked on the extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 last year, I know that no Member of Congress came in in opposition to it. The legislation involving this \$120 million this year was nearly as large last year. The reason it is larger is purely and simply because there are more impacts. It is because of the shift in military personnel to match the impact in any particular district at any particular time. The only Members that came before that subcommittee last year were those with particular problems in their districts. They documented their problems; they outlined them carefully, and they were taken care of as the case arose by remedial amendments to the legislation. This is in no sense a grant-in-aid to the States. It is purely and simply for the maintenance and operation of the schools required to educate the children of our defense workers and our military personnel. If you are going to start cutting things like this you will really get into trouble with the educational system of the United States. A bill involving this tremendous amount of money is passed by a voice vote, without rollcall. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), when he says he would cut it, has been silent on the votes for it. He did not vote against it last year. He did not make any move to have a thorough airing of the need for it. He takes the well of the House and in the interest of pure figures, which mean nothing except that they are dollars, he would ignore the education of the children of his constituents who are stationed, because they are in the service, in my district, in northern Virginia, at Fort Benning, Ga., California, and all the States of the Union. This is irresponsible and arbitrary action.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has said that my only interest in this was interest in dollars. May I add, education of children as well.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad you stated that, that your only interest was in the dollars and not in the children, because I also said that the children from your congressional district who were in the districts of other Members, because they are children of people in the armed services, need education, whether you think they are worth the millions of dollars that you are trying to cut.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, I do not yield.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I rise today to object to any part of these efforts to reduce this budget and to economize. On the contrary, I support this overall objective to reduce expenditures.

I realize as has been mentioned several times before that it is a lot easier to support an economy drive when it does not affect your own congressional district. And I confess that this proposed cut does hurt my congressional district, and that it is probably one of the reasons which inspired me to take the floor today to oppose the amendment.

I would like to point out, however, that every one of these cuts in this appropriation bill affects my congressional district. You cannot cut these requests for appropriations without causing some personnel problems within the various agencies and threatening a possible reduction in force, and as I probably spend 50 percent of my time dealing with personnel problems it is not easy for me to support any effort which might cause these problems to be aggravated. However, I have talked to hundreds and even thousands of Federal employees, and they have assured me that cuts could be made. They are the first to attest to the fact that efficiencies can be effected in these agencies, that there is waste and that there is duplication.

So I will take the risk of being charged in the future, possibly for political purposes, of injuring Federal employees by voting to cut these appropriations because I believe we can effect economies in these agencies without an indiscriminate reduction in force. I do not think we can effect these economies and reduce expenditures by reneging on our moral and legal obligations. If we did that we could have a field day, because there are many other places we can economize by reneging on our obligations.

We can reduce this budget and economize by eliminating various services we have enjoyed in the past; we can abandon some proposed projects, we can bring about greater efficiency in operation.

But we cannot properly economize by cutting appropriations under Public Law 874 where the Federal Government has moved into these areas and impacted these areas and the land which they use have been taken off the tax rolls. Employment in these areas has increased,

the communities have been required to provide various community services as a result, and yet the property taken by the Federal Government does not yield taxes to the various communities. We, the Congress agreed a few years ago that we would merely pay a portion of the cost to those communities of educating the children of the Federal employees who live or work on that property, since the community would receive no taxes from the use of Federal property.

Arlington County has been mentioned. We have tremendous Government operations in the county and we do receive a great deal of money under Public Law 874, but that is not the answer to it. The Federal agencies in that county now have the most valuable property in the county. If that property were on the tax rolls as ordinary business property it would return something like \$11 million or \$12 million in revenue to the county. As it was, last year Arlington County received approximately \$1 million under Public Law 874. Furthermore, the parents of more than 55 percent of the children in the county schools either live or work on the Federal property from which the county is receiving no tax benefits. The county officials have testified that if the Federal Government would pay what it should we would not need these Federal funds under the Federal impact program.

If we are going to follow a policy of reneging on our obligations let us strike all funds from the bill and not do it piecemeal. The Federal Government created these problems; I think the Federal Government should assume its responsibility in the matter. I, therefore, hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, have several of these Federal-impact areas in the district which I have the honor to represent. One of these communities is a beautiful little town near the Ohio River. It is one of the oldest towns in the State. For many years it was quiet and serene. It could meet all its local needs. During World War II the Federal Government moved in and built a powder plant and a powder bag loading plant. It is the largest powder plant and the largest bag loading plant in the world.

Immediately the school population increased from 400 to 1,400. If it could have taxed this Government property this school district would have been in very good shape, but 40 percent of the taxable property in the school district was taken off the local tax rolls because it now belonged to the United States.

I do not know the exact value of this Government property, but I have heard it was worth \$200 million. But, even if it were worth only \$50 million, if it were taxed at the normal rate that local community would have been able to build a fine school building there and maintain it.

In Indiana we have a limitation on the amount of bonds that can be issued, based on the assessed value of taxable property within a school district. So, with 40 percent of its taxable property

gone, this school district was unable to issue bonds in order to build a larger school, and yet the community found themselves with a population increase of from 300 to 400 percent. Their children were going to school in the administration building of the powder plant, in the recreation hall of a housing project, in the school-building basement and other such places.

About that time a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House began work on this problem. I think this subcommittee was under the leadership of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. He did an excellent job. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] was on that subcommittee, as was the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER]. They did yeoman service on that subcommittee.

They evolved this plan of aid to Federal-impact areas where the Government would do nothing but be a good citizen and do its part in helping build and support the schools needed for the people it had brought to these communities. A school was built in that community, I spoke of. But it is not sufficient to build a school. It must be operated and maintained. And so the Government makes grants to these districts for school operation and maintenance.

This appropriation we are now considering provides for Government contribution toward support of these Federal-impact schools and our committee recommended a larger sum for that purpose in the bill this year. Here is the reason why: Naturally in passing any law there are some defects left in it. Last year the Committee on Education and Labor brought a bill before the House which undertook to correct some of the defects in this Federal-impact school program and that bill became law. It made several changes in the original law.

First, it eliminated the so-called "absorption clause." This clause had provided that the Government would not take into account all of the federally connected schoolchildren in granting aid to a school district. Instead the clause had required that the district must absorb a number of federally connected children equal to 3 percent of the number of pupils in the district who had no Federal connection. The absorption clause proved to result in an injustice, and it was repealed by act of the last Congress.

Under the old Federal-impact law, aid to these school districts was governed by two limits. The grants made per federally connected pupil had to equal the average amount per school child which was being spent by the local district. Or, it had to equal the statewide average sum spent per pupils, if that sum was larger. The law was changed last year so that the payment per federally connected pupil must be at least equal to the national average of sums spent by local school districts for each pupils. This new formula increased

the amount of money required for the program substantially.

There were other, smaller changes made in the act. One very important reason why this increase in the appropriation came about is that the number of children in the Federal-impact areas is continuing to increase. There is a rising population in Government housing projects on military reservations. That may be a cost of defense, but it is a cost that is met in this appropriation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. A good bit of the expense involved here would be brought about by having to take care of districts due to the fact that they have no tax base, due to the fact that the Capehart bill would build housing facilities on bases where there is no tax base at all. It is a little bit different from the ordinary operations.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Of course, under the old law, before the 1956 act was passed, the Government would have paid for the schooling of those children if they went to schools off the military reservation but lived on it. The Government made a contribution to the local government for those children's education.

This program simply requires the Government to be a good citizen. Congress passed the 1956 act increasing the amount of Federal-impact money that should be paid and I do not think you have any alternative but to carry it out. All we are asking today is that the Government be a good citizen and do what it should do for the affected school districts just the same as if it were a private citizen.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman feel that \$113 million is being a pretty good citizen?

Mr. DENTON. It depends on how many children have to be provided for. If this Government property were taxed by the local districts at the same rate that private property is taxed, this sum we are appropriating would be only an infinitesimal part of what the Government would pay in taxes to support schools in Federal-impact areas.

This is asking the Government to pay a small part of what is required by good citizenship, in the light of the problems the Government has created.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from New Jersey, I believe it was, also discussed this bill not from the standpoint of why we need this increase of \$13 million, but I would like to know whether we really need it. If we need it, that is a different proposition.

Mr. DENTON. I tried to point that out; but we passed a law last year making some changes in the program. I pointed out a minute ago that Congress abolished the 3-percent absorption

clause, and the amount of payments is now set by a different formula. Those are two things. Then a third factor is the Capehart program, where housing was built on the Federal reservations, but the property on the reservation cannot be taxed, and more people are living on the reservations now than before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since we have gotten into a discussion of the merits of this particular program rather than the appropriation item, I would just like to make a few observations which occurred to me during the hearings on this particular item of the appropriation bill which is now before us.

There is a great deal of interest by chambers of commerce and other civic-minded organizations to bring this Federal defense activity or that activity to our home congressional districts. It seems that the first thing that happens after a new Federal activity is brought into one of our districts is that it becomes an impacted area and immediately the school board in the area runs to Washington for some loose Federal tax dollars. It seems that every one welcomes a defense activity up until it is actually established but as soon as it is the area claims great distress and immediately wants impacted Federal school aid.

Under this program since 1951 we have had a continuing increase of impacted school districts, and I believe that the definition of an "impacted school district" has come to mean very little or nothing. In 1951 the total appropriation for this particular work was \$28.7 million for 1,172 school districts. This has gone up until in 1956 there was \$90 million made available for 2,864 school districts. The school districts which qualify under this particular act were more than doubled in a period of 5 years. Last year \$113,050,000 was appropriated for 3,000 school districts.

Now, I think the committee was very wise in drafting this legislation. They did not make any set payments to the particular school districts involved. There is no open end formula that is used in granting aid to these impact school districts under section 3 of this particular law. Section 3 of the act is where most of the money is made available. As a matter of fact, the Education and Labor Committee wrote into that legislation a provision that the aid to those districts would be geared to the amount of money that was made available each year by the Congress.

If you turn to page 272 of the hearings, you will see that that specific question was asked by me, and the answer was in the affirmative. I think that certainly a program such as this should be gone over very carefully by the Education and Labor Committee, the legislative committee of this House, because we are getting into a position in this particular program where there are going to be hundreds and hundreds of school districts that are going to be run-

ning to Washington and using this program to qualify for Federal aid. You certainly can't blame them when the door is wide open. I think there should be a complete revision of the formula with the insertion of a need test in the aid formula.

Mr. Chairman I would like to read from page 271 of the committee hearings:

Mr. LAIRD. The vast majority of payments are made under section 3?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Vast majority of payments are made under section 3, where there is no need test. That is on the assumption that you are making a payment which is in the nature of an in-lieu-of-tax payment by reason of the tax-exempt Federal property. You calculate that payment not on the basis of an assessed valuation of the Federal property times the locally effective tax rate, but you calculate the payment on the basis of the local share of the cost of providing education for the children of parents who either reside or are employed on tax-exempt Federal property, or both.

Mr. LAIRD. How do you explain the difference, taking a metropolitan area such as Milwaukee, where large industrial plants are located? Many of the workers in these particular plants are living outside the city limits of Milwaukee, and they pay their income tax and their property taxes in the suburban community. Compare that with a situation here in the District of Columbia, where the people work inside the District but they are paying their income taxes out in Virginia and their property taxes in Virginia. They receive Federal aid in Virginia. Is that right?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Yes; largely upon the basis of the tax-exempt place of employment of the parent, Government workers who commute daily to the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAIRD. But their need might not be as great as some suburban area where there is no plant property located.

Mr. GRIGSBY. That is true. There is a fine line which is hard to draw. If you put this thing wholly on the basis of the needs test, there may be some of these school districts, 3,000 school districts, which on the basis of need never would qualify for Federal payment.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Education admits that on the basis of need many of these school districts would never qualify for Federal payment. This administration insists on a need test on Federal construction aid for education. I am sure their position is consistent as far as this program for impacted school-district aid is concerned.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that it would not be necessary for me to ever be called upon on the floor of the House to come to the defense of this legislation. It is generally conceded by Members of the Congress and by people who are not in the Congress as being the most equitable and beneficial legislation approved by the Congress in the past decade.

You will recall that I was the original sponsor of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. The amendment affects Public Law 874. I conducted hearings over the entire country. I think we took testimony from six-hundred-and-some witnesses in 42 States. The legislation was approved unanimously by the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. It came out of the committee with a unanimous vote, came to

the floor of the House and was approved without a rollcall vote. In fact, on one occasion, in 1954, I personally wrote in on the floor of this House an item of \$55 million, in a deficiency appropriation bill, to support this program. I am surprised that anyone would have the temerity today to offer an amendment to cut the funds in this particular type of legislation.

The gentleman's intentions may be perfectly all right. But why would we argue about a few million dollars? When this legislation was being written one of the greatest handicaps we had to overcome was the fact that the late Senator Wherry had offered legislation to permit the building of residential property on military bases. Today the program is complicated by what is known as the Capehart Act, which was touched on just a minute ago, under which the Federal Government builds on property where there is no tax base at all; where all the property is owned by the Federal Government.

How can the Government comply with its responsibility under the act—and that is what the gentleman agreed the Government was trying to do, take care of its responsibility for having impacted an area. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] also said that the definition of an impacted area had lost its meaning.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Could the gentleman tell me just how much of the total appropriation items deals with Capehart-Wherry housing? I think the gentleman would be surprised at how small the amount is.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know that I can quote the exact figure, but I am talking about the intent of legislation such as the Wherry Act and the Capehart Act that took care of the grading of the streets, the building of sidewalks, the installation of a sewer system, of a water system, and of everything else except providing for schools. That is what this increased amount of money is for, to provide largely those very things for the operation of the school system in those districts.

Let me say to the gentleman that the Government has assisted a total of 128 school districts in which Government activities were carried on. Let us go a little bit further. In the last 6 years under that program we have built \$1,200 million of school classrooms. I would like to ask the gentleman what the classroom situation over the Nation in general would be today if it were not for that. We are claiming a shortage of 149,000; \$1,200 million would build approximately 45,000 classrooms. So, if they had not expended that money under this program today we would have a shortage of over 200,000 classrooms in the Nation.

We are not talking about construction now. We are talking about maintenance. I have in mind certain districts. I remember Camp Hood, in the State of Texas. The entire camp had been set up as an independent school district. There is not a single dollar of taxable property in it.

You are building housing facilities there, you are going to take people in there, there is going to have to be money to maintain those school districts, and there is not a dollar of tax base at all. It is just simply out of the question to talk about not providing money under those circumstances.

Let me say to the gentleman that not one single school district in my district, the Third Congressional District of West Virginia, has qualified or even asked to qualify; and let me go further and say that only one district in the entire State of West Virginia is asking to receive any money under this program.

As a former school man I considered it my business to try to do something for the boys and girls, not particularly for the school districts because I do not care where they are imported. I did not want to see a situation like that exist. I went into the district myself as chairman of the subcommittee. That was before some of the gentlemen who are sniping at this program even came to Congress. I happen to know the situation. Of all the legislation now pending in this category of appropriations for administration of welfare programs, this is one item you cannot afford to cut because the people you are cutting are unable to supply it because they have no tax base to supply it.

I sincerely hope we will get away from this idea of looking at an item and saying, "So many million dollars have to come off that," whether we can justify the reasons for taking it off or not. I know the gentleman from Ohio, who is the author of this amendment, does not like the idea, but a lot of that money is going into the State of Ohio. A lot of the reason why that item is as large as it is is that much of it is going down around Waverly, Ohio where they are building an atomic installation. So I think people ought to be consistent.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

(Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the question as to the obligation of the Government to impacted school districts has been well established so I shall not labor the point. Of all the programs we have observed in our committee in connection with education, we consider that this has been one of the best run and best managed programs. We feel that the general estimates and the activities of the administrators of it have been generally sound. I do not want to see us spend any more money than is necessary but in this particular case these estimates and requests are based on formulas established by Congress.

We have not observed a pattern which you often hear about in Government departments. We have observed rather an effort to actually do a job that is required in this type of program.

I will grant the argument of some of those who would claim there ought to be a different method of payment. We do owe an obligation. We either ought to pay rent or we ought to pay taxes or something for the use of the land. But

we are looking into the future as to a different type of approach when we say that we ought to pay taxes or we should pay rent. I am quite willing to consider that type of approach. I think there is a great deal of merit in it. But we are dealing with something now which is already the law of the land. Certain formulas have been set up and the administrators of this program are endeavoring to ask for the amounts necessary under the formula.

For example, I noticed an item here, that struck me as being very indicative of the type of people making these estimates. If you will look at page 11 of the report from the Committee on Appropriations, you will notice that we are speaking of payments to school districts and that that has been upped thirteen-million-and-some dollars, which has to do with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. But, if you will look right underneath that item—assistance for school construction, that also has to do with the impacted school districts. That is Public Law 815. There were two laws in connection with this program—Public Law 874 has to do with the present amendment; that is, for maintenance and operation. The other is Public Law 815, having to do with school construction. It says here the bill includes \$41,700,000 for school construction in these impacted districts, a reduction of \$100,000 from the request and a reduction of \$66,800,000 from the appropriation for 1957. It has been stated in arguing for this particular amendment that we should leave it at the same figure as fiscal 1957. To show the good faith and the good thinking of the administrators of this particular program, this represents for school construction a reduction of sixty-six-million-and-a-fraction dollars, showing their willingness to face the realities of the situation. We have heard a great deal about the expenditures of certain districts on various frills and extra lovely types of deluxe equipment and so on. The amount given by the Federal Government to a district does not depend on the expenditures of any particular district for deluxe items, but rather is based on the general average of maintenance and operation costs in the State for comparable school districts. When the average for comparable school districts is obtained, allotments are set for each district, including that particular district, which may be using deluxe methods. But that will not increase their appropriation no matter what they happen to spend on something extra. It is fixed for that particular district based on similar comparable districts in the State. I hope you will vote down this particular amendment in the interest of the continuation of a good program.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Are there more of these impacted areas now or are they getting larger, and is it because of that they need this extra \$13 million for administrative purposes and maintenance purposes?

Mr. McCONNELL. I think you will find a large part of the increase in fiscal 1957 is due to a change in the allotment amount in the formula; an increase in school population; and an easing of the absorption requirements under certain conditions, rather than a big expansion in the program itself. No, I would say we are gradually correcting the serious impacted school situations.

Mr. MASON. On the construction end, you have cut that.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is exactly right.

Mr. MASON. But on carrying on the ordinary expenses, you have increased the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. My interest in this legislation is to see that every child has an opportunity to receive an education. One of the Members spoke relative to the Wherry housing. It is true that the Congress has provided for Wherry housing. In some of the towns, the Wherry housing is just coming into being where people who are connected with the armed services are now being directed to go to the reservation where there is no tax derived in any form as far as the individual is concerned. Those young men who are in the armed services certainly have a responsibility to be filled because of the obligation that we placed upon them. They are not there because they want to be there. They are there because we have passed legislation that made it mandatory upon them to be a part of the armed services. If we are going to make it mandatory, then we have a responsibility to fulfill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that last year the Committee on Education and Labor, in extending the act also liberalized it to the extent that a child whose parent is stationed outside of the continental United States or outside of the school district but who remains at the original station is now still carried on the books of that school district under Public Law 874, and would this not in some measure account for the relatively modest increase?

Mr. McCONNELL. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think there is one thing overlooked in this proposition, and that is that in these impacted areas the wages and income of the people is higher than that of the average in the United States. Take the case of Arlington, Va., for instance. The average wage in

Arlington, Va., is in excess of \$6,000 per capita. In some of my school districts it is less than \$500 per person. You are asking the taxpayers in my district to help support Arlington, Va. I think that is wrong. If I had a tax income in my district such as they have in Arlington, Va., I would apologize to every Member if they came here and asked for help.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this bill, but we have reached the point in the bill where I am extremely interested because of the various extensive Federal impacts in the State that I represent, New Mexico. The Federal Government several years ago believed it should own a little private school in New Mexico called Los Alamos. It moved the school out very quickly and took over this mountainous school location. On that site was developed the first atomic bomb known throughout the world.

We now have the "County of Los Alamos." No people remain there overnight unless they are employees of the Federal Government and children of those employees. We have more than 15,000 people at Los Alamos. That is one impact. Certainly a little county could not build schools, because it was largely a farming area, with a sparse local population and modest property values.

Then we have White Sands, at Alamogordo. That is where you have your guided missile proving area. One area comprises a range 38 miles wide by 140 miles long. There are a great many people who have moved in there. The community of Alamogordo, which was just a town, is now about 10 times more populous than the entire county was previously. The people who were there certainly could not provide schools for this Federal impact. We welcome these Federal installations, but recently we objected to withdrawal and acquisition of more land. I made a trip back home to protest this extension of some 800,000 additional acres near Fort Bliss and White Sands. The people who lived there were largely ranchers, owning or leasing those lands. About 132,000 acres belonged to the State of New Mexico. That was recently condemned and taken over.

There was one old rancher, John Prather, a great American, down there who was 82 years of age. He did not desire to sell his place, and he put everybody on notice, including the Federal Government, that if they condemned his place he was going to live there until he died anyway.

They condemned the place, and just a few weeks ago he was notified that he could not live there until he died, because that property was going to be needed. Later the Army agreed to let him live in the home where he had resided for a

half century, but he must give up his land and dispose of his livestock.

These areas are chosen for the Federal Government by specialists who know what they need in this critical era through which we are passing. They selected White Sands because it was the only place in the United States that would meet their needs.

We are using a great deal of uranium. About 10 days ago I was asked by the gentleman in charge of raw materials at the Atomic Energy Commission to prepare the people of Grants, N. Mex., for the fact that in 20 months they would have 10,000 more people in that area. In that particular area around Grants there are two counties, McKinley County and San Juan County. Sixty-eight percent of the known uranium in the United States lies in those two counties. Who do you think owns that uranium? We all do, the Federal Government. It owns more than half of it. You cannot take an ounce of uranium out of the United States or sell it to anybody but the Federal Government.

In Albuquerque we have the enormous Sandia Base as part of the atomic energy and armed services setup, as well as Kirtland Field, an Air Force base. They contributed in the past few years to making Albuquerque the fastest growing city in the United States. The school population was swelled enormously.

Near Roswell, we have Walker Air Force Base. Near Alamogordo is Holloman Air Force Base and at Clovis, the rapidly expanding Clovis Air Force Base. Every one of these communities has experienced a sudden impact from immigration of Federal employees and their families. In every case this immigration has resulted in demands upon schools and other public facilities costing so heavily that the communities and local populations could not possibly finance the required expansions. Because of the developments inspired by the Federal Government's need for uranium and development in the natural gas and oil industries, the city of Farmington in San Juan County is doubling and redoubling in population. The bulk of this growth is due to Federal impact alone. Part of it, of course, is brought about through developments on the Navaho Indian Reservation, another Federal activity from which no tax income is derived. If Federal assistance is not provided, this community cannot possibly meet the demands for expanded schools and other public facilities.

We are happy to have this terrific increase in population, but we will be very regretful in not being able to take care of the children or find room for them to go to school. We are not asking the Federal Government to come into New Mexico to select these places; the Government wants and demands those locations because they serve an essential purpose. That is the story.

Now, I want to talk to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow, who introduced this amendment to cut off \$13 million. If uranium had not been found in New Mexico and it had been necessary to buy it in Canada or Africa the price would be much higher than it is today.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. KNOX asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, the committee report undoubtedly has been based on recommendations of the Department of Education. The report states that the Department of Education estimates of funds required have been relatively accurate during the past few years and the committee saw no reason to doubt that the estimate presented is the most accurate that can be made at this time.

I know that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who introduced the amendment, must have had some justification or basis of determination in offering the amendment. What I would like to ask of the committee is how many additional installations have we today than we had 1 year ago that would be subject to this cut?

Mr. FOGARTY. The reason that the costs have gone up is because of the changes we made in the law last year.

The main change was the introduction of an alternative minimum-rate provision. That is largely responsible for the increase, because they tell us it has increased the entitlements about 32 percent over what it had previously been. But we made that change last year by an almost unanimous vote of this House. Everybody was for it. Now, of course, we have to pay the bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Regarding the numbers involved I would like to refer the gentleman to the testimony of Mr. Dethrick to the effect that some 3,000 school districts have participated in the program in the fiscal year 1957 and the fiscal year 1958. You will have an attendance of 1,125,000 federally impacted pupils in 1957 and 1,230,000 in 1958.

Mr. KNOX. It is my opinion that over the past 4 years I have been a Member of this House, the House has consistently made appropriations to take care of the expanded need caused by new installations of the Federal Government. Through these new installations there has undoubtedly been brought about considerable impact of schoolchildren upon the school districts. What I am really interested in is the basis of the Department of Education in asking for this additional \$13 million. Is it based upon the additional responsibilities that have been placed upon the Department of Education for new installations or by legislation enacted by the Congress?

I spoke a moment ago about the Wherry Housing Act. It is true that within my district the personnel of the installations have been housed in the city in private dwellings. The Wherry Housing Act is in effect and they have started to construct new housing facilities on two installations which will take the people from the downtown area that were making some contribution in rental payments toward the welfare of their child and possibly the welfare or education of all their children and now Fed-

eral housing is putting them on military reservations. In my State no one gains residence or loses residence by the fact that they are housed on a military installation. I am wondering as to what it will do as far as enrollment is concerned, whether or not the schools would be obligated to educate these children who are in this particular area because of the installation.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I do not know whether this will answer the question of the gentleman or not, but on the hearing a member of the committee asked Mr. Grigsby the following question:

"What causes the increase in the estimate for the coming year beyond what will be used in 1957?"

Mr. Grigsby answered:

Increases in 1958 over 1957 are attributable, one, to a normal rate of increase, or the rate of increase in the number of federally connected children which we estimate to be about 8 percent in 1958 over 1957.

Then another reason advanced by him:

The other is the increase in the rate of payment per child in 1958 over 1957. I think we used for purposes of estimate about 5-percent increase by reason of greater attendance and 5 percent by reason of increase in rate.

Mr. KNOX. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the present amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was passed in 1950, it carried with it an appropriation of \$25 million to get it into operation. We were meeting then in the new House Office Building in the Ways and Means Committee room. I opposed the bill at that time and the \$25 million appropriation that went with it. Since then I have seen the light and I have found out that this is one of the best programs we have in the educational field.

From the time in 1950 when we authorized the original expenditure of \$25 million to go along with the bill every time that we did not appropriate the full amount requested, amendments were offered on the floor of the House and they were carried by overwhelming majorities of 6, 7, 8, and 10 to 1. On every amendment that has been offered since 1950 to increase or to bring it up to the estimate that the educational people thought they needed, there was overwhelming support.

How good is the estimate? We think the estimate is good and that is why we say so in our report. In the 8 years of operation of these 2 laws, 815 and 874, for the maintenance and operation of these schools and school construction, their estimates have been on the conservative side. In many years they had to come in and ask for a deficiency appropriation in order to meet 100 percent of their entitlement.

What will the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio do to these

school districts? It will not affect just Arlington or any one school district. There are 3,400 school districts that are in this category of federally impacted areas that will get a portion of these funds, based on the number of school-children attending school in that area, under the formula laid down by the Congress of the United States. This is what it will do. It means that each school district will have to suffer a 12-percent cut. In other words, we will not be keeping our word to the school districts as we told them we would a year ago, because when we enacted into law this formula that they are operating under now, we certainly lead them to believe they would receive 100 percent of what they are entitled to, not 88 percent of what their entitlement will be under the provisions of the amendment that we have before us now.

Now, this amendment means that every school district, every one of these 3,400, will be cut down by 12 percent. It will not come out of 1 district in Georgia or 1 in Texas or 1 in Michigan, but every one of them. Instead of getting 100 percent of what they are entitled to, they would get only 88 percent of what they are entitled to.

This question has been asked many times: Why has this figure been raised? If you will look on page 262 of the hearings, I asked this question:

Mr. FOGARTY. What are the new liberalized provisions of the bill? How does this affect the cost?

Mr. GRIGSBY. One of the major changes was to introduce a new alternative minimum-rate provision. Heretofore the payments to the local educational agency were based upon the number of children in average daily attendance in the preceding fiscal year, school year, times the local contribution rate. The local contribution rate was the local share of the cost per child of providing education from local sources, local revenue sources.

There was an alternative minimum rate which said that the rate of payments should not be less than one-half of the State average per pupil cost.

The last Congress added a second, or alternative, minimum rate which stated that the rate of payment shall not be less than the national average of the local contributions rates paid in the second preceding year; so you have in effect three possible rates. You pay the highest of three rates—either the amount per child from local revenue sources, or one-half of the State average per pupil cost, or the national average local contribution rate.

It was the introduction of that last minimum-rate provision that is largely responsible for the increased cost both in 1957 and in fiscal 1958, because it increased the rate of payment in both years.

As I recall the figure, it increased it by about 31 or 32 percent over what it had previously been.

One other change made by the last Congress in Public Law 949 was to move the base for counting the number of federally connected children from the preceding school year to the current school year. That was to take care of the situation in many of these federally affected districts in which there had been a rapid increase in the number of federally connected children, and when you dropped back a year you got no reflection of that rapid increase in federally connected children except as it might have been reflected in another section of the act, section 4 (a) in which the eligibility requirements were higher than in section 3. So

they moved the base year of payment from the preceding school year to the current fiscal year, so we had in effect here a reflection of a 2-year increase in the base in terms of the number of federally connected children. That increased the cost substantially.

There were other minor amendments which increased the cost somewhat, too. One of these was the provision by which children of parents who had moved into a community when their parent came in under military orders for employment on a base, these parents living in taxable homes off base and being employed on base, a provision by which those children might continue to be counted as federally connected by the local educational agency after the parent was ordered overseas or to another station and the children remained in the community. That would increase the number of federally connected children somewhat.

A second minor change was to permit the counting of the children of employees on certain airports, I think there were about seven of them, which were owned by municipalities, airports owned by municipalities but under contract with the Air Force for air cadet training.

A third was to permit counting as federally connected those children of parents who were living in public-housing projects which were disposed of and transferred to private or municipal agencies, permit the counting of those children as federally connected for 1 fiscal year beyond the year in which the sale or transfer of that public housing took place.

Those three minor amendments all increased the cost somewhat but not very materially.

The major reason for the increase is pointed out in the general statement. It is the continued increase in the number of federally connected children and the continuing increase in the rates of payment per child.

When this law was enacted in 1950, we thought at that time that it was a fair responsibility of the Federal Government, because the children going to these schools do not have any choice where their parents move or where their parents are working. If you want to cut down the appropriation that we are requesting in this bill this year, you are denying a good, decent education to those children in these federally impacted areas, because their parents have decided to go to work in a Government-operated factory or are serving in the Armed Forces of this country.

Another thing that is contributing to the increased cost is that in the last 4 years the birthrate has been going up, not only among those people who are working in impacted areas, but the statistics that I have read show that the overall population is increasing every year. Now, if you want to put a ceiling on the number of children that can be born each year in these federally-impacted areas, that is one way of cutting down this budget, but I certainly would not offer such a suggestion as that. But, because the population in these federally impacted areas has been going up and up, and when we lay down the formula by the laws that you voted for and I voted for, then under this formula we come up with an increase in these entitlements. That is more than a formula commitment to these federally impacted areas. I think it is a real moral commitment on the Government. It is one we ought to keep. It is the word of the

Government that we have given to these local communities that if they met the formula as laid down by Congress, we would put up X number of dollars. I think we ought to keep our word and by keeping our word we will vote down this amendment.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of what the gentleman has said, especially about the new formula. It is fair, it is mathematically accurate and is a big improvement. This formula is the cause of much of this increase. I might say, too, that I associate myself with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] in pointing out to you that in the uranium area we have whole new settlements just coming in that will require additional funds.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to close by reading a telegram that I received this morning. I think we may assume that many local communities are in the same condition as this one which is in my congressional district. May I say that another reason this bill was passed I think was mentioned by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] today, that in many of these smaller communities where defense factories have been located, they did not have the property to tax in order to pay the full cost of these educational facilities. I received this telegram this morning:

Disturbed to learn that attempt is being made today to cut fiscal 1957-58 entitlement Public Law 847 by 12 percent. This means 30,000 loss already in North Kingston budget adopted March 26, 1957. Financial town meeting. We urge your opposition to any cut in these funds—regards.

That has happened in community after community. The budgets have already been arrived at. If this \$14 million cut is voted today, it would mean a \$30,000 deficit in the school finances of a small town, that is an awful lot of money to a small town. It is \$30,000 less than our word or the Government's word of what the contribution would be for the education of these children.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. As I read the hearings, I got the impression that we were pretty liberal in counting the number of children eligible. Do we not permit them to count the children, say, of a commuter who commutes 50 miles to a Government installation? I should like the gentleman to clear up the record on that point, because there is a great deal of interest in it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I asked that very question and it appears at page 264. I asked:

Suppose a person is living 50 miles away from an airbase? Is the town in which he lives 50 miles away eligible for Federal funds for his children going to school there?

Mr. GRIGSBY. If the parent commutes daily, even though it may be 50 miles away, they are eligible to count children of that parent if there are 10 or more such children, and if the number of such children is equal

to 3 percent of their total average daily attendance.

That is not some decision that was made by the Office of Education. That is in the formula that was adopted by Congress last year, which I voted for and for which 95 percent of the Members of this House voted. They are only following the dictates of this Congress when they count such children. It is not a question of being liberal in their count. It is just a part of the law that you and I voted for a year ago.

Now in just a minute I would like to summarize what this amendment would mean if it passes.

The effect of the amendment to reduce the appropriation for "Payments to school districts" in fiscal year 1958 to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1957 will seriously hamper the school programs of many school districts. In effect, such action, if sustained by a denial of supplemental funds later in the year would represent Federal action to shortchange the school districts on the full amount of their entitlements as specified in Public Law 874.

All 3,400 districts which participate in this program would have their Federal payments reduced to about 88 percent of the amount the law specifically entitles them to receive. In many districts which receive a substantial part of their school revenues from this Federal program this action would necessitate a curtailment of school programs through the shortening of school terms or the dismissal of teachers in order to get along on a reduced budget. A number of school districts which are heavily dependent on these Federal funds are in remote unpopulated areas where there is little local wealth to be taxed and where State funds to supplement local resources are unavailable for inadequate. The school budgets of most districts receiving these funds have already been prepared for the next fiscal year and in many cases they have been approved by local boards of education on the expectation of receiving the full amounts of their Federal entitlements. The Federal Government ought not at this or at any time to renege on the implementation on its promises to these school districts as set forth in the statute.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this subcommittee has pointed out a situation that should be corrected by the proper legislative committee. The theory behind the impacted area was the impact of war installations as a part of the cost of national defense. But what are we running into today? We are running into a situation right here around Washington where long-time House employees, staff members who have lived in these communities for years and years, who own property there, who pay taxes there, have received a questionnaire asking, "How many children do you have in school?" Then Uncle Sam kicks into that school a contribution as an impacted school. The presence of these employees' children had nothing to do with defense. While the Department may construe the law to include all Federal employees,

I for one, certainly did not think that was our intention.

Just to show what I mean, here is a copy of the questionnaire and the accompanying list of Federal officers. This was received by a constituent who has lived in his community all his life. He is not there as a result of any defense activities and is not employed in one. The questionnaire refers to all Government contracts, not just defense contracts.

FEBRUARY 1, 1957.

To Parents in the Prairie District Schools (Prairie, Porter, Highlands, Belinder):

Public Law 874 entitles schools to Federal funds if the parents are employed on Federal property or by companies holding Federal contracts. The teacher will keep track of the days in attendance and funds will be allocated on this basis.

Will you please complete the information on the attached sheet and return it to your child's teacher.

A list of properties we may claim as federally connected is given below:

Air Force Plant No. 2 (commingled) Fairfax Plant, Kansas City, Kans.:

- *General Motors Corp., B. O. P. division (all but transportation dock).
- 711 Armstrong Property, Kansas City, Kans.:
- *Social Security.
- *United States Army.
- Fairfax Field, Kansas City, Kans.:
- *Civil Aeronautics Administration.
- Federal Office Building 911, Walnut, Kansas City, Mo.:
- *Bureau of Internal Revenue (Treasury).
- *Bureau of Public Assistance.
- *Bureau of Public Roads.
- *Civil Aeronautics Administration.
- *Corps of Engineers.
- *Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- *Immigration and Naturalization Service.
- *Social Security.
- *United States Agriculture.
- *United States Air Force Recruiting Office.
- *United States Children's Bureau.
- *United States General Accounting Office.
- *United States Weather Bureau.
- *United States Department of Labor.
- Fort Leavenworth, Leavenworth, Kans.:
- *United States Army.
- General Services Administration, 2306 East Bannister, Kansas City, Mo.
- Grandview Air Force Base, Grandview, Mo.:
- *United States Air Force.
- Kansas City ORC Armory Site, 1628 Central:
- *Kansas City Armory.
- Kansas City Records Center, Independence and Hardesty:
- *Army Map Service.
- *Army Home Town News Center.
- *Army Veterinary Corps.
- *Kansas City Records Center Office.
- *United States Army.
- Knob Noster, Mo.:
- *Sedalia Air Force Base.
- Lake City Arsenal, Independence, Mo.:
- *United States Army.
- Municipal Airport, Kansas City, Mo.:
- *Civil Aeronautics Administration.
- Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans.:
- *United States Navy.
- Naval Industrial Reserve Aircraft Plant, 95th and Troost, Kansas City, Mo.:
- *Bendix Aviation (Atomic Energy Commission).
- *Bureau of Internal Revenue.
- *Westinghouse Electric (Includes TWA test cell).
- Post Office building, Kansas City, Mo.:
- *United States Postal Service (regional).
- Sunflower Ordnance Works, DeSoto, Kans.:
- *United States Army.
- United States Army Training Center, 345 Minnesota, Kansas City, Kans.

United States Courthouse, 811 Grand, Kansas City, Mo.:

- *United States Post Office (regional).
- *Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- *United States Marines.
- *United States Navy.
- *United States Department of Agriculture.
- *Treasury Department (Internal Revenue).
- United States Federal Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans.:
- *United States Army.
- United States Public Health Service (Kansas City field station) 3900 Eaton, Kansas City, Kans.:
- *United States Public Health.
- Veterans' Administration Hospital, 4801 Linwood, Kansas City, Mo.
- Veterans' Administration Center, Wadsworth, Kans.:
- *Veterans' Administration.

HAROLD C. DENT,
Superintendent.

PRAIRIE DISTRICT SCHOOLS, 19—19—

This information will be used to establish eligibility for Federal aid under sections 3 and 4, Public Laws 874 and 815:

Telephone: Residence-----
Business -----
Name of family-----
(last) (first) (middle)
Addresses during year-----
Child's name-----
(last) (first) (middle)
Date of birth ----- School -----
Grade ----- Teacher -----
Date parents became residents of this school district:
Father ----- 19-- Mother ----- 19--
Name and address of property on which father works -----
Employer -----
Name and address of property on which mother works -----
Employer -----
Employed across State line? -----
If so, do you commute daily? -----
Date father began employment on property -----
Date father left employment on property¹ -----
Date mother began employment on property -----
Date mother left employment on property¹ -----
In military service-----
Date began -----
Date terminated-----
Name and address of Federal property living on -----

Signature of parent or representative
Date child entered school in this district-----
Date child enrolled this year-----
Date child dropped school in this district-----
Days attended while Federally connected for each reporting period: (Keep current)
1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ Total-----

Signature, Teacher, Principal, Supt.

¹ If employed at end of school year, indicate same (for example, still employed February 1, 1957).

From this list you can see how far this goes. All of those things were never intended as an impacted area. I have a great many friends out home who were born and raised in the community. When war came they went into a defense plant. Later on they took some other Federal job there. They have lived there, they have raised their children there. The impact of the war plant did not bring these people there, yet these people get the questionnaire just the same. Em-

ployees of the Veterans' Administration who have lived in my community all their lives and who have children in school get the questionnaire, and their children are counted in. The whole thing shows how unrealistic the interpretation has been. Of course, if we said it in so many words, the Department cannot help it. They may be following the formula, but they are sure the formula is wrong.

In my own area we have defense plants, but many of the people working there have lived in that community ever since they were born. They did not cause any impact on that area. They own property, they are paying taxes on that property. They are there just the same as all the rest of us.

As a matter of fact, I understand that a Member of Congress living over in Virginia is included as one of those who makes an impact on the school area. He received a questionnaire as to how many children he had in school. He is buying property there and paying taxes on it, including school taxes. Congress certainly predates any defense impact.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. This amendment is not going to correct any inequities under the present law. The gentleman claims some are being paid 100 percent. This amendment will take 12 percent off the appropriation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Perhaps if there is a decrease made it may cause the legislative committee to take another look at this situation and then count those that are really defense impacted. An example is the situation as the gentleman mentioned here, about some new uranium area that is going to be a new community and there will be people coming in there who will be under the defense program. You can understand that. But where you are counting people that have lived in a place ever since they were born and have been raising children there, they should not count as any impact, and it just is not called for.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the point was raised further that sometimes appropriations committees try to legislate. This is just that in reverse. By attempting to cut this \$12 million now we are attempting to legislate, to add legislation to an appropriation bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The Appropriations Committee and the House can always put limitations in any appropriation bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. The right way is to correct the basic law; is not that right?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Maybe we cannot wait that long.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee handling school construction legislation, and this angle of it has been assigned to my subcommittee. If the gentleman has some legislation to correct that problem, we would be glad to take it into consideration.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am just pointing some of the things that are wrong. These people have lived there all their lives. They are not impacting any area. In many of these cases a defense plant may have come in, but the people would have been there anyway, so the defense plant did not make any difference as far as they and their children are concerned.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will bring in legislation to correct it, we will have a hearing and correct that situation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman from West Virginia has always been courteous, considerate, and kind to me. If I can just get a little time from the Appropriations Committee work, I shall be glad to make some suggestions.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman that cutting this appropriation will not do anything that will remedy the problem in the future.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It could be made to apply to this year and of course could save quite a few hundreds of millions of dollars in the future.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I think the gentleman has made a great contribution to our thinking on this subject in bringing out the point he has. May I ask him, a member of the Appropriations Committee, this question, whether or not if this reduction were made it would be possible to get the administration of the law not to spread it as a percentage reduction to each of these areas but rather to take under consideration some of the things the gentleman has mentioned and resurvey this question of what the proper distribution of these funds should be?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know whether it would have that effect. But, certainly, this calls for a certain amount, and you do not have to appropriate for every authorization. Any authorization is just that and no more. If the authorization was going to be all that there was to it, there would be no reason for having a Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the answer is absolutely no, the Office of Education cannot use any discretion in deciding where this reduction would be made, because you fixed in the basic law the way that these funds would be apportioned. There is no way they can change it. They have no leeway whatsoever. If you are going to cut it back by passing this amendment then there would be a cut of 12 percent for every one of those 3,400 school districts. There is no other way around it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of points, and if I have time, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, one of the problems that have developed this year is the problem of authorization of construction of Capehart housing. Last year in the housing act of 1956, the bill provided that on any base that Capehart housing was constructed, the Department of Defense had to take steps to acquire by purchase the Wherry housing that existed on that base. I would like to give you a specific example of the situation at the Travis Air Force Base in California. Over 900 units of Wherry housing were built under the Wherry law. That housing under the Supreme Court decision has been paying local taxes to the counties and school districts. In the housing act of 1956, that Wherry housing is going to have to be purchased by the Federal Government and it is going to go off the tax rolls and the school districts will not receive a dime from those 900 units. In the meantime, the Air Force has advertised and the bids are out right now for the construction of 500 additional units of Capehart housing at that same base. That means there is going to be a combination of 900 units that up to this year were paying taxes to the local school districts and that are now going off the rolls plus an additional 500 units that are going to be built that will not be contributing a dime. This legislation is the only salvation and the only possible solution for the school districts in a problem area like that. These school districts are completely depending on the bill that we passed last year in good faith in this House of Representatives and in the other body.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to commend the gentleman, for he is the first Member of Congress to get up on the floor today who has really put his finger on the necessity for leaving these funds the way they are in this bill, and that is because it has to do with the operation of Capehart housing. If there were no other reason, that alone would justify the appropriation.

Mr. BALDWIN. The only possible solution that the school district in areas such as this has is the legislation that we passed last year, legislation upon which they are entitled to rely and legislation upon which they have based their budgets. If we take action at this time to cut 12 percent off that bill, we are losing faith with every school district in the United States which is completely dependent on the honesty and sincerity of this Congress and on the action that we look last year.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I have not spoken on this legislation that has been on the floor for a week, and in view of the fact that I shall not seek any more time to speak on this legislation, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what he is going to talk about?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I rose in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from Michigan can make his own inference.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank you. That is all I wanted to know. I wanted to hear that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to this amendment. I may be accused of having selfish reasons for objecting to this amendment. If representing the people of my district, the Fourth District of the State of Missouri, to the best of my ability, makes me selfish, then I stand convicted. Lake City Arsenal is in my district. Grand View Air Force Base is in my district. Knob Noster Air Force Base is in my district. Also Bendix and Westinghouse that are presently engaged in the manufacture of products for national defense. Schools in those areas are impacted by the influx of workers in that arsenal, those air bases, and those defense plants. Therefore, I am in opposition to any cut in funds in this bill for aid to schools in impacted areas.

This bill has been on the floor for almost a week. What are the things for which the money is being appropriated in this bill? I will list most of them. Bureau of Labor Standards, veterans' employment rights, Bureau of Apprenticeship, employment security, employees' compensation, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Women's Bureau, Wage and Hour Division, retarded children, problems of the aging, printing for the blind, Food and Drug Administration, Freedmen's Hospital, vocational rehabilitation, control of venereal diseases, tuberculosis, sewage treatment, hospital construction, Indian health activities, medical research, Cancer Institute, Heart Institute, Dental Institute, St. Elizabeths Hospital, where I have ideas of going some day of my own volition, after hours and hours on the floor of this House, Social Security Administration, old-age and survivors insurance. That is what this bill is for.

This bill has been considered by the Committee on Appropriations of this House, whose chairman is the dean of our Missouri delegation, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, who happens to be sitting in front of me right at this time. The ranking member of that committee is Hon. JOHN TABER, than which there is no more conservative Republican on the floor of this House. They have had that bill before them for weeks and weeks and weeks. It has been read in that committee paragraph by paragraph. That committee has worked its will on that bill and reported it to the floor of this House. I am forced to say that because of the things that these dollars are being appropriated for, this House has cut and haggled and scissored for a week. Who does this bill benefit?

The people that pay the taxes that run this Government, the greatest Government and the greatest business on the face of this earth at the present time. Let me say to you that 80 percent of the income-taxpayers of this Nation earn less than \$6,000 a year. Do not get me wrong. I did not say that 80 percent of the income tax was paid into the United States Treasury was paid by people who earn less than \$6,000 a year, but 80 percent of the number of income-tax payers are people who earn \$6,000 or less.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Eighty percent of the amount of dollars that come in come from the bracket below \$6,000.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman. My figures vary from his a little, but that makes my case still stronger. I thank the gentleman.

I do not know why we are haggling so much over this bill. Someone has said that we will have a rollooff on these cuts. I hope we do.

If this House really wants to save the taxpayer some money it can easily be done by lopping at least a billion dollars off foreign aid when it comes to the floor of this House. I am reliably informed there will be an unexpended balance of five to six billion dollars at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1957, so there is the place to save money and not take it away from our aged, our children, and sick and our vet's programs.

I am ready to vote against every cut made in this good bill right straight down the line and accept the bill as it was reported out to the floor of the House. What have we got an Appropriations Committee for anyway? I did not sit in the hearings; neither did the majority of you members. You do not know what the testimony was and will not unless you read the testimony that was given before the committee, and I will bet that not 20 percent of the Members of this House have read even the report in its entirety. I trust that committee, and I am willing to accept the bill as it was brought to the floor of this House.

Maybe some of you think you can curry a little political favor by voting for these cuts. Do not kid yourselves. My Democratic friends on the right hand side of this aisle, let me say to you that when you vote to cut out money that is needed in your district and my district for the people who pay the taxes, and when we have another congressional election and that barrage of Republican propaganda descends on your head and some of those programs like aid for the blind and the aged and schools and health in your district have been crippled by the cuts you vote for, your opponents will say: "President Eisenhower said how much money he needed out here, but the Appropriations Committee cut that out, a committee having more Democrats on it than Republicans—cut over a hundred million dollars out of this bill. The House not satisfied with that took out other millions and the House was Democratic, and if you have not got enough money to carry on the operations in your district, blame the Democrats for it."

The fact that 95 percent of the Republican Members of this House may have voted for these cuts will not help you one whit.

Time after time I have shown up Republican legislation and proved that it was wrong and not in the best interest of the people of my district, and Republican propagandists came back to me with this. They said, "We could not help it; it is the result of things the Democrats did in the 20 years before we came into control of the office." Remember, my Democrat friends, we and we alone will be responsible for cuts in this bill even though the cuts receive almost solid Republican support. If you think you can curry any favor by cutting down these appropriations, you are just as wrong as you ever were in your life.

I am ready to vote to restore every cut this House has made in this bill and take it exactly as it came from the committee.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I want to compliment the gentleman on the contribution he has made. I just want to express my opposition to the pending amendment and to urge the members of the Committee to vote it down.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my entire congressional district is an impacted area, and I think it is probably one of those prime examples of how this kind of appropriation can be of beneficial effect. Despite the fact that the district has on every occasion overwhelmingly passed bonds for new schools, and has accepted again and again raises in the tax rates to operate these schools, had it not been for the grants under these Federal laws, the Long Beach unified school system which not only covers my district but extends and expands into that of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE], could not have met its load.

There is a definite problem that has been brought up by the heat of the debate here today, and that is: If you have read the report you will notice that the purpose for which the money is being used is gradually shifting over from the construction of buildings to the operational maintenance of schools, with more emphasis on the latter than on the former as time goes on.

There also are changes with respect to the communities which have been impacted; they are gradually increasing the tax base by reason of the fact that the new activities are becoming fairly permanent, so permanent as distinguished from temporary enlargements of the communities are occurring. This enlarges the tax bases of the communities.

What I am afraid of is that the debate we have had today indicates that at some point along the line we are going to be asked for appropriations under the program at which Congress will suddenly rebel and end the program suddenly and entirely without prior notice by refusing any appropriation. In that event, that one \$30,000 difficulty of one single school district mentioned earlier in the debate would be multiplied by millions and mil-

lions of dollars in thousands of school districts throughout the country. I think the gentleman from Ohio in offering his amendment had something of that kind in mind. I do not believe he was irresponsible or arbitrary at all in offering the amendment. I do believe he voiced a warning that at some point Congress must decide where we are going and whether this program is to be a permanent program or not. The size of the appropriation has a definite influence on when the question is faced. The larger the proposed appropriation, the sooner it will come up. As a matter of fact, the program started out as a temporary affair with absorption features that would require a less amount every year and eventually bring itself to an end. I do not think from today's debate that elimination of the absorption feature definitely gave the program premanence.

Now, is it or is it not going to be a permanent program? That is something in excess of 3,000 school districts must know for purposes of their financial planning. Are we coming to some year in this Congress where the whole thing will be wiped out in one fell swoop? Or, if the program is not to be permanent, are we going to adopt a deceleration procedure which will permit the local districts to make an orderly adjustment? There will be distress in all these districts if we do not do some long-range thinking on this problem. I ask that you have these facts and questions in mind, and that perhaps as time goes on the appropriate committees, including both the Education and Labor and the Appropriations Committees, can bring to the Congress something of a more express nature as to whether it is a permanent program or a policy of eliminating the program. I believe all concerned would benefit by such an expression.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a considerable interest was shown a little while ago in some facts that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] brought out. That seemed to me to be quite an important thing.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the present amendment should be adopted. I believe there will be plenty of money to take care of all of these school districts where there is a legitimate claim upon the United States to provide for the schoolchildren, if we were to adopt an amendment immediately after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] was adopted, which stated:

Insert on page 18, line 9: "Provided, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be paid to any school district on account of children whose parents have heretofore lived in the district or paid taxes in the school district or who pay rent to taxpayers for real property where they reside in such school district."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is a constructive approach to this problem and I commend

the gentleman for working it out. The situation to which the gentleman from Kansas called attention presents an almost ridiculous case. It is possible under this present law for an adjoining district to Washington to get aid simply because there is a Congressman living there. If that is true, we certainly should provide against such an eventuality as that by a limitation on this appropriation. It seems to me it is sound. If the reduced figure is accepted, as I am inclined to believe it should be, we should then add on such provision as the gentleman from New York has suggested which would take care of the situation that is troubling so many of us.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman. It seems to me it is perfectly clear that is the way to handle the situation. I believe—and I have listened to the hearings on this item—that there is no question but what they will have plenty of money and more too if we adopt this kind of a limitation on the paragraph.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There was never any thought, so far as I know, that we would consider staff members of Congress who lived here all these years and the employees of the Veterans' Administration, the Post Office Department, the Internal Revenue Bureau, and all of those as being people who caused impacting, when those people are taxpayers and lived here all their lives. They were not called in by any of these activities; they were already there, and the demand for them would be there whether they were Government employees or not. This has gotten to the point where it is all inclusive or counting almost every Government employee, no matter what his activity is, or any employee in a defense plant no matter whether he lived with his parents or grandparents. It just is not a realistic approach, and I do not think it is what the Congress had in mind.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, let us not be dragged away from the question before the House.

You know, when the tribe first consented to sit down in a circle and listen to one man at a time talk about one thing at a time, orderly parliamentary procedure was established. Here this afternoon we ought to invoke again the old tribal law under which the tribe gathered about the campfire to decide what should be the policy of the tribe in those ancient days and they talked about the one question that was under debate.

The question before us here today is whether or not we will retain the amounts appropriated for this purpose for the current year or whether we will increase them.

It might be said by way of preface that the law under which we made special contributions to impacted districts was a wartime measure. We are no longer at war. Normal conditions have been resumed. Certainly, because during the war we found it necessary to meet these sudden shifts of population to the war

plants for the manufacture of war munitions and war weapons does not mean that it should be in force today. But, the effort has been made to lead us away from the point that is before us.

Trying to get away from the question before us some have tried to make this a labor bill. They have insisted that because you were opposed to increasing amounts appropriated for the current year, you are against labor. In the same way they have tried to make this an education bill and to leave the impression you were against education. But the one issue before us is economy. This is an appropriation bill and the question of labor, or education or all these other issues are not before us at all.

No man can stand on this floor and say that I have not supported labor during my entire service in the House. I have been on the floor longer than any Member here today. At the desk I saw SAM RAYBURN and CARL HAYDEN come to the House. And, in all that time there I have supported every one of the fundamental laws establishing the rights of labor which I have not supported. My district was at that time an agricultural district with practically no labor organization. Most of you men so vociferous in your support of labor came from labor districts. You had to be for labor. But I was for labor in a farm district because I thought agriculture and labor had a common cause and were preyed on by the same predatory interests. I was for labor legislation because I thought it was right and not because it was the politically expedient course to follow. I was for the Norris bill, the Wagner bill, the Walsh bill, the Wage and Hour and Portal to Portal bill and no one can stand on this floor and tell me that because I am for reasonable appropriations and against excessive appropriations and excessive taxes in these critical times, I am anti-labor. And I have in season and out of season supported education and every bill for education and vocational education through which the children of America have been benefitted.

So don't try to make me out as opposed to education. The children of the Nation will suffer more from lack of food and clothing when we pass excessive bills and increase the cost of living and hammer down the purchasing power of the hard-earned dollar their father received for his daily toil than they will lose—if at all—from the passage of this highly salutary amendment.

So, Mr. Chairman, we should not allow ourselves to be drawn off into collateral issues. Let us follow the old tribal custom of talking about 1 thing at 1 time. The thing before us today is whether or not we should increase the appropriation for this purpose. It is not a question whether it is good legislation or bad legislation, whether it is a good purpose or a bad purpose. It is a question whether \$113 million is sufficient instead of \$127 million.

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this measure today points up the necessity for a serious congressional study to be made of payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government in those areas where they have large Federal installations. I think some of the arguments that have been made here today, both for and against this amendment, show some of the inequities in the present program with respect to the distribution of these moneys for aid to impacted areas.

For example, there was the point made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and endorsed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], which is a very important point in connection with a program such as this. And it is important to my own congressional district because there are many, many people in that particular category in my congressional district. But this whole matter of Federal payments in these areas not only for schools—because there are other things, other services that these Government installations and the employees there require; there is police protection, fire protection, and all the other various services that a community affords which must be paid for by the people living in those communities, which are aggravated when more and more people suddenly are brought into the community. It is no answer to this problem today to say, "Well, my district would like to have some of these new Federal installations, whether they pay taxes or not, because they bring in new payrolls." If you follow that argument to its logical conclusion then I would ask whether the same gentleman would say that all of the private enterprises in his district should be made tax free because they bring in payrolls. That argument does not make any sense.

No, this whole problem of Federal payments to local areas where they are affected by Federal installations, in lieu of taxes, should be seriously studied by this Congress. That question has not been. I understand there has been some staff work done on it in some committees, but the study has not been seriously undertaken by any committee of this Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is so right in what he is saying. I apprehend that perhaps he and I differ on this particular amendment before us; I do not know about that. But this Congress should do something about this problem of Federal installations coming into these communities tax free. In my district there is only a relatively small number of them. In the gentleman's district there are undoubtedly many more. But this is something that should be grappled with by this Congress in the appropriate committee. I have had a bill in for years on this subject, as many other Members have. No one of us probably has the exactly right answer, but we should do something to provide for payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government to these various areas where they are now using the facilities of sewer and water and, as the gentleman said, police

and everything else, way beyond what is involved in this bill. The gentleman has put his finger on something very important for this Congress to tackle.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

As far as this particular bill is concerned, I will vote against this reduction. I will vote against any further tinkering with this particular program until we do solve the matter and solve it conclusively and intelligently by a restudy of this whole program.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that because of the more liberalized formula that has been adopted the net result of following this amendment would be that we would be reducing payments to the impacted school districts by 12 percent?

Mr. HYDE. That is as I understand it; yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting here very patiently to say a few words about this amendment. Perhaps the delay was worthwhile, because the issue seems to be getting bigger by the minute. We have just heard from the chairman of the committee and from the ranking minority member in support thereof and in opposition to their committee proposal.

I may say with respect to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that quite probably his proposal would be subject to a point of order because he would be attempting to legislate in an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is not correct on that, in my opinion. It is a clear limitation.

Mr. HAGEN. Let us say possibly it would be subject to a point of order. In any event, it is legislation which would alter the program in a fashion which, if it should be accomplished, should be done by the basic committee concerned with this legislation, the Committee on Education and Labor.

Actually what we are doing here in appropriating for this program is deciding what is a reasonable estimate of the needs of the program as established by the Congress. The Department and the committee have said that \$127 million is a reasonable estimate. I for one am inclined to accept their estimate.

What happens if we overestimate what is necessary to carry out a clear statutory formula? If we overestimate, the money is not spent, it still remains in the Treasury. We have not lost a thing.

If we underestimate, what happens? If we underestimate we create a real problem for all of these some 3,400 school districts, because they plan their budg-

ets, a great many of them, on the basis of the availability of this Federal entitlement. If you say to them "You can have only 88 percent of a budget instead of 100 percent of a budget, and they need schoolteachers, they need janitors, they need school supplies, and they have to really struggle with the problem of educating those children. Either they have to water down the quality of the educational service they give or they have to resort to various expedients which cost the program more in the long run.

I know of one school district in my congressional district that has only one substantial source of operating funds, and that source is this Federal program. What happens if they get 88 percent of their necessary budget? In the past this has happened, and they have had to borrow money to pay their teachers and the janitors and to pay for their school supplies. Borrowing the money calls for paying interest, and the money comes from a source which is of dubious legality as far as legal ability to lend is concerned, so that they have had a very difficult problem.

Actually when we have underestimated in the past the Department has come in later and asked for more money by defining appropriation to complete the program and the Congress has acceded to such request, so if you make a wrong underestimate here you are not saving any money because the deficiency will be provided next year. In the meantime, however, you have seriously inconvenienced a large percentage of these 3,400 school districts and these million plus schoolchildren around the country, so that you have not accomplished anything except to harass the beneficiaries of this program. In effect you are indulging in an idle act as far as saving money is concerned, and I am certain you do not want to do that.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I just have 2 or 3 observations to offer. One of them, for whatever pertinence it has to this discussion, is that we are constantly told that employees in the federally impacted areas contribute nothing to the schools, and that in many instances there is no tax base provided. I would just like to observe, and this is not by way of negating the principle of aid for impacted areas, that in the State of Michigan 2 cents of every 3 cents sales tax on the dollar goes to school aid at the State level. That is paid by employees and by persons connected with the Government in the federally impacted area. The second observation I want to make is with reference to the remark made, I believe, by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] that one reason for this increase this year in the proposed budget is the fact that there has been an increase in impacts. I am not going to argue that explanation or that point. But, certainly, insofar as

there are increases in the bureaucracy, apparently there are increases in impacts. And insofar as there are increases in impacts, there are increases for need or for alleged need for aid. It seems to me there is a moral to be drawn from that. If we do happen to curtail the bureaucracy a little bit, we curtail the impacts and we curtail the subsidiary addition to and because that addition results from the increased size of the bureaucracy. One final thought. Some of these days we are going to be talking about proposals to put the Government into some new activity in competition with private enterprise. It may be in the field of atomic energy. Some day we are going to be talking about some new type of Government activity which private enterprise ought to carry out. May I respectfully remind the House that insofar as this House votes to do that and insofar as that becomes policy, we create more impacts and by competing with private enterprise take fields of activity out of areas where they can yield tax support for the Nation and for the community and for the State.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out an illustration in my own district which I think may throw a little light on the workings of this bill. I represent two counties here—Duval and Clay. Clay County is a small rural county which has been a small rural county for 100 years or thereabouts. In that county, 50,000 acres or thereabouts are taken away from the tax rolls and from the turpentine and timber developments for the purpose of having a standby infantry camp which is nonproductive as far as taxes are concerned. Secondly, in that county there is a mothball fleet of the Navy. The Navy selected it because it has fresh water and these ships are well taken care of there. I am old enough to remember World War I and the mothball fleet following World War I. After a while they were a pretty sorry spectacle and you began to wonder where you were going to get the money to get rid of that fleet which was cluttering up the streams, now that they had become outmoded. Certainly, there is nothing very permanent about that kind of military installation. With respect to the personnel that were brought to this small rural community, are they people who went there voluntarily? No, they are there involuntarily because they are all Navy personnel. They have brought their children there. Their children do not have any choice about going there, but neither do the parents have any choice about going there. So we have a small rural county which was getting along pretty good before they had this military installation put there, and which now has a terrific burden upon its taxes and upon its opportunities to educate the people who have been brought there.

There might be other counties where the need is not so great, but in approaching this matter we should bear in mind the thought, that after all this is not the place to write legislation. If there are some improvements or changes you want to make in this legislation to improve it here and there, there is a legislative committee. Your ideas should be brought to that committee. They should be ironed out and considered there in the proper manner, so that everybody has an opportunity to study it, so that the proper staff work can be done upon it, so that we do the proper thing. It seems to me this amendment would be unfair to a small county which was getting along pretty well before this military installation came, which has no great benefit as a result of the military installation, and where this military installation may sometime go and leave in that river a tremendous fleet of boats which will have to be destroyed.

So I urge that this particular amendment be not adopted, that we allow the full funds and take care of this much needed educational work.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would not the gentleman's problem be solved by the adoption of this amendment, plus the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER? I think the gentleman has put his finger on a case where there is a real impact, and where this law is sound and should take care of an unusual situation such as the gentleman has mentioned, but there are other areas, like for instance Washington, where a Congressman's child is counted in the area. I am sure the gentleman would agree that is not sound. But if the figure is still sound but it is properly allocated so as not to include such areas as the gentleman mentioned, you would have the answer to the problem.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is not much sense to the argument made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] because the basic law has been the basic law since the first time this was passed in 1950. If sufficient funds are not appropriated by the Congress to match the formula that they lay down, then the available funds will be prorated among the 3,400 school districts. There is no other way about it.

Mr. KEATING. But there will be sufficient funds—

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I refuse to yield further.

I am not in favor of the amendment before us now and after all I was supposed to make some final remarks in this debate. Personally, I feel this is no way to write legislation on the floor of the House. I did not even hear the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I don't think many others did. I do not think that is any way to tamper with an important program of this type.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow), there were ayes 49, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 18, line 10, after the period insert the following: "Provided, That none of the funds herein in this paragraph appropriated shall be paid to any school district on account of children whose parents have heretofore for 5 years or more lived in the district and paid taxes for school purposes or who pay rent to taxpayers for real property where they reside in such school district."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to correct what seems to me to be an abuse in the distribution of the funds under this act. It seems to me that we should try our best to correct it and that the correction will result in saving the money that would have been saved had the Bow amendment been adopted.

I believe the situation is quite serious. They tell me that children of Members of Congress who own houses in the suburbs of Washington are used as a credit by the school district in fixing taxes. I expect that the children of anyone who carries mail or who does anything else for the Government, who is an employee of the Veterans' Administration, are counted toward this sort of gratuity.

It would seem to me that in this particular situation the Committee on Education and Labor needed to go to work and try to bring in an amendment that would correct this bill so that cases of this kind could not happen.

It does not seem to me that anyone should oppose this amendment but that everybody should be for it, because the only way we can ever get credit in this world is by doing the thing that seems to be right; and that we should do this seems to me to be perfectly clear.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me in the light of the defeat of the Bow amendment that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is even more necessary now that we are retaining the larger figure in the bill, to insure that the money be not squandered, as I would put it, in the method outlined, and that it be used only in those areas where the impact has been real and not under such fantastic conditions as the gentleman has been describing.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Let me ask the gentleman this question: After listening to the gentleman's amendment as it was read, and to the statement he made, I think the gentleman is trying to solve a problem that the Committee on Education and Labor had before it in the early days, a problem that dealt with the larger cities of the Nation where there is plenty of taxable property and plenty of room for increased millage for school purposes.

I have been trying to think of the major cities of the United States that have been participating in this program. I think the gentleman has some reference to the fringe of Washington; at least he put his finger on Maryland and Virginia. Would this go beyond that?

Mr. TABER. It would go all over the country. They tell me that in one city in Missouri they count employes of the Veterans' Administration; they tell me they have done the same thing in New York and in many of the communities. I think the children in this situation that I have described in the amendment have not the slightest claim to a Federal subsidy. That is the reason I have offered the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, the substance of what my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offers might have some merit but it certainly should be presented to the appropriate legislative committee of the House to determine in a more deliberate manner, if it has. This amendment that is offered now, although it is not subject, as I see it, to a point of order, because it is in the form of a limitation, to me is legislating on an appropriation bill. I do not believe that we today in 7 or 8 minutes should attempt on an appropriation bill to change the intent of Congress and change the basic law. How far this amendment will go I do not know, and neither does anybody else here in the House. An amendment like this deserves a hearing before the appropriate legislative committee. I do not think we as members of the Appropriations Committee should assume the responsibility of the legislative committees of the House. As chairman of this committee I have never gone to the Rules Committee for a rule waiving points of order on any of these appropriation bills that I have had anything to do with and I do not intend to as long as I am on this committee. I do not like legislation on an appropriation bill, especially when it goes to basic matters as this one does. That is exactly what we would do by adopting this amendment. I was pretty sure the Bow amendment would be defeated because it was a blow against education. This should be, too, under these circumstances because I do not know how far it will go and feel certain no one else here does. I hope the membership of the committee will follow the vote on the last amendment and vote down this amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Are there any statistics available at all so that the amendment could intelligently be acted upon?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

Mr. HOSMER. This would stop the whole program until a lengthy process of an entire census was taken?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is absolutely right. When this particular appropriation was being considered, this matter was not gone into at all. We have no justification in our appropriations hearings for the adoption of such an amendment. The justification for the formula that we have in the basic law was adopted after long hearings by the Committee on Education and Labor and after this bill was extended 2 or 3 times in the past 6 or 7 years by the Congress of the United States. This is not the right way to do business. There may be something in the gentleman's argument but I think it should be presented to the proper legislative committee, a hearing should be held, they should take action, then come back and make their recommendation to the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I do not see how it is possible to correct this situation unless we go about doing it. Now that we have the chance, let us do it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am trying to reason with my friend. It is a responsibility of the proper legislative committee to change the basic law. I do not think that we as members of the Appropriations Committee ought to assume the prerogatives of the standing committees of this House. I am not for it, I never was for it and I hope I never will be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will agree with me that certain legislative language has already been stricken from this bill on a point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman has indulged in legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Most of that was put in years ago and has been carried year after year because it has never met with objection from a single Member. We have never attempted to defend any points of order that have been raised on such legislation and we have never gone to the Rules Committee to ask for a rule waiving points of order in connection with this particular appropriation bill. I do not expect we ever will. And I might say further that the legislation we have included is largely to straighten out small procedural matters rather than to change the basic concepts of legislative enactments as the pending amendment does.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. As I understand the amendment, it excludes children if the parents have been in the community 5 years or own a home?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot tell the gentleman for certain. I could not be certain that it may not go far beyond what the intent may be without spending much more time on it that we can now.

Mr. DENTON. The point is that it does not hit the problem. The real problem that we have is that the Government owns a very large part of the property in many of these areas, it is not subject to taxation, the local community cannot tax the property or raise money through taxation. This amendment would kill the whole program.

Mr. FOGARTY. When the old 3-percent absorption clause was eliminated it was stated that an area either is federally impacted or it is not. That is the question that was raised then. It either is or is not. We are changing the basic law if we adopt the amendment. There might be some merit to it but if there is a hearing should be held by the proper legislative committee, then a report made to the House.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe that the gentleman from Rhode Island hit the nail on the head when he said the main objection to this amendment is that it is something that should be worked out in the proper legislative committee. This formula under which this law is administered is a very complicated and confusing formula. The formula is not satisfactory to me, and I would like to have it amended by the proper legislative committee. At the present time the communities have to absorb 3 percent of the children of federally connected employees attending the local school. The formula now provides for 50 percent of the cost to the local community for educating the children of Federal employees who live or work on Federal property. Regardless of how long the people have lived there—and the term "impacted" has been used quite often here—the basic purpose of the legislation, as I see it, is recognizing that the Federal Government, owning the property in these various communities which are taken off the tax rolls, should provide some means of reimbursing the communities for the education of these children. We have to provide some form of payment in lieu of taxes. Again with reference to the employee who works or lives on Federal property, the Government under this legislation only provides for 50 percent of the cost for educating that child, with 50 percent contributed by the local community, and that again is based on what it costs a comparable school district in the various States. It costs the citizens of Arlington County \$320 a year for each child. Under this legislation we only receive \$96 a year from the Government for children of Federal employees who live or work on Federal property. It is not a bonanza to any of these communities. We would all be much better off if the Federal Gov-

ernment paid its just share of taxes. But, if they want to change the formula, let them take it before the proper legislative committee and not do it on an appropriation bill.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. A year or two ago a survey indicated that the per family income of Arlington County was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$8,500 per year, which was the highest per family income of any county in the whole United States. Does the gentleman claim that Arlington County has any need for these federally impacted school funds and that they should be paid for by areas of the country where the per family income is, say, less than \$4,000 per year?

Mr. BROYHILL. I would say that the average income per family in Arlington County is one of the highest in the Nation, and it is one of the finest communities in the Nation, but that does not relieve the Federal Government from its responsibility and requiring that community to render service as the result of their operations.

Mr. PILLION. The county of Arlington has very little industry and the primary cause of the high per family income is mainly because of the Federal Government payroll; is that not true?

Mr. BROYHILL. That is true, but that does not mean the Federal Government should receive tax exemption on all the property that it owns.

(Mr. BROYHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, on March 28, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 4166 the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, speaking of the President, said:

This is his budget. This is not merely a recommendation. He was forced to defend his own budget because of the rebellion against him by the majority of his own Members in this body. The President said that his budget had been drawn up, and I quote: "Carefully, intelligently." How historic it is that a President feels that he is on trial and must defend himself to the point of having to say that his budget has been drawn up "carefully, intelligently." The President also used in his press conference the word "futile," and I quote that in connection with cutting the budget, as he said, "severely," that too big a cut in foreign aid, for example, would endanger the country's national interest. I called that to the attention of the country some weeks ago when I was on the television program conducted by our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I projected my mind ahead. Drawing on my years of experience in Government, I said, "Where can the sharp cut come?" It must come along the lines of least resistance. My mind focused on foreign assistance—not that I approve of that method but I saw that that was the easiest way. When Secretary Humphrey started the revolt, when the executive budget was sent up, that was the time the President should have acted. Humphrey's revolt became contagious and it is now a revolution

among the great majority of the Republican Members. President Eisenhower said he took the responsibility for his budget. Well, we got that out of him anyway. He has his responsibility to try and stop cuts being made that will affect our national interests. He will have to do something more than make statements in a press conference. He will have to go to work and he will have to go to work among his own Republican Members and Republican leadership.

The President ought to know that in the committees and in the House of Representatives practically all the members of his own party are the ones who are attacking his budget and by their votes they are showing that they do not believe his budget was drawn up, and I quote again, "carefully, intelligently." The President leads one way and his army in the House of Representatives goes the other way. What a picture. And who do they think they are fooling? It is not my responsibility to give President Eisenhower advice—I, the Democratic leader—as to how he should meet the situation.

One thing is certain, when a Democrat was President he at least had the majority of his own party supporting him, not by words "I like so and so," but by votes.

Oh yeah? Remember when at least twice when President Truman vetoed a bill the Democrats, then under their present leaders, furnished the votes to override President Truman. Was it not just last week when by some 57 majority they refused to follow the party line? They have just as many on that side who vote their convictions as do we.

Now, do not the Republican Members remember what they did over on the Democratic side when this bill first came before us? That budget, that they now cite the President as saying was a model, carefully and intelligently drawn up. Permit me to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who is at the moment sitting over on our side, and I am glad to welcome him in behalf of all the membership on our side—does the gentleman remember what the opposition said to the President about the budget, to the cutting of which they now so strenuously object. On rollcalls 17, 18, and 19, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], voted to send it back to the President. Three times on March 12 the majority leader and the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. FOGARTY] voted to send it back to the President with a request he tell us where to cut it. Did the gentlemen want it cut or were they just passing the buck? And now that it is back—do they want it cut? If they do not, just why did they ask the President to tell them where to cut. Just how inconsistent can the gentlemen on the other side be?

It would be a pleasure to have our good friend from New York [Mr. ROONEY] tell us what is wrong. On the 28th they told us the President said the administration had drawn up the budget carefully; a fine budget. But it was the same budget they had sent back to him on the 12th. Now on April 1—is it because it is All Fools' Day—they say that any cuts which the President said we should make if we found it possible to make them, should be voted down? Do

the Democrats want the budget cut or don't they?

Is there anything we can do—and if there is, I would like to have the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] tell us what it is—just where the cuts can be made—that will please them? That is, if it will reelect a Republican Congress, or elect a Democrat Congress in 1958 and elect a Democratic President in 1960—just those things.

Mr. FOGARTY. You remember 1947–1948, do you not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. You were doing the same kind of a job then with the same kind of combination you have here today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I quoted that earlier in the day.

Mr. FOGARTY. You remember how sure you were you were going to elect a President in 1948.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I never was; some were. I am never sure of an election until after the votes are counted and a certificate of election is in my hand.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought Mr. Dewey was from the State of Michigan and you were one of his prime supporters in the election of 1948.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He was from Michigan. He was, I thought, the better of the nominees, but I never fell in love with him. My choice was Bricker and later Bob Taft. I quoted your statement earlier today. Permit me to quote it again—and to save a few cents I will strike it from my previous remarks:

You remember the election of 1946 when the Republicans swept the country, elected a Republican House and a Republican Senate. You also remember that in the campaign in 1946, they were going up and down and across the country promising the working people of our country, that if they were elected, the friends of the workers and the workers of our country would be fairly treated. Yet you must recall that the first thing you did was to enact the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. And then when this appropriation bill came before you, you cut it 25 percent in 1947. We Democrats made a pretty good record in 1947 on the floor of this House in fighting those amendments. And then in 1948 you helped to cut it another 20 percent over 1947. So, you made a splendid record in that 80th Congress in cutting appropriations for the Department of Labor. But, what happened in the election of 1948? Because of your help in cutting these appropriations to such an extent, especially in the Department of Labor, and taking away the rights and privileges that the Department extended to the working people of this country by denying them the enforcement of these laws, the people reacted in the fall of 1948 and you woke on the day after election the most amazed persons on this earth, because nobody believed at that time that a Democrat could win the Presidency of the United States as Harry Truman did in 1948.

I want to congratulate you now, because the same combination that was working in that 80th Congress in 1947 and 1948 is again in effect yesterday and today and tomorrow. The same leaders are leading the same fight, and I hope that you have the same success and I hope and pray that your success in cutting these appropriations will guarantee

that a Democrat will be elected to the White House 4 years from now.

The gentleman from Connecticut said that resulted in the election of a Democratic Congress.

The gentleman said that, did he not?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman said he hoped that our cutting of these items in the budget would result in the election of a Democratic President next time; am I correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So we see there is nothing political about this Democrat opposition to any economy. If any cuts—even though they told the President to tell them where it could be cut—oh, no.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought you would have more sense than to go along with all these cuts and bring the same result on all over again in the next Presidential election. I thought that you had learned your lesson.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am still thinking that our people do not want inflation, they do not want additional billions given for foreign aid. I still want to protect and promote the welfare of our people. I am not so much concerned about the politics of the gentleman in the White House as I am about the future of our country, the record of the party itself, and my own record. In my opinion there is not a Member of the House who does not believe that we cannot continue the present rate of spending without overburdening our taxpayers.

Mr. FOGARTY. We are just trying to help your President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Help the President? Will the gentleman pardon me if I say that that is just as sincere as some other argument?

Mr. FOGARTY. Or vice versa.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just quoted the gentleman as saying—daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4036—"I hope and pray your success in cutting these appropriations will guarantee a Democrat will be elected to the White House 4 years from now." Mr. Chairman, if the RECORD does not show beyond any question that the gentleman has said that he hoped that our cutting of the budget, an end which the people say they want, would result in the election of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, then I do not understand the English language.

Mr. FOGARTY. I did say that. It is in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely; then the first objective is the election of Democrats.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just thought you would have more sense than to do again what you did 10 years ago. I did not think you would want to do the same thing all over again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I shall, if it is the right thing to do. It is not my purpose now—it never has been—to buy my way into office either by the making of promises which cannot be kept or by imposing unconscionable burdens upon one group of citizens to gain the votes of a majority. Oh, I know that method has in some places on occasion been suc-

cessful. In the end if continued it will ruin this Nation—great and rich as it is.

Tax and spend—and so elect—the taxers and the spenders was the political philosophy of Harry Hopkins—but it brought no permanent good to our people.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me any proposal to change the formulas under which payments are made under Public Law 874 should at least be given the courtesy of a hearing so that the 3,400 school districts that are affected by this would have notice of the hearing and have an opportunity to express themselves as to how this affects their particular situation. It seems to me that is the least courtesy we can pay to those school districts. They have read the law we passed right at the close of the session last year. They have gone ahead and prepared their budgets on the basis of that law. I think we owe them a fair hearing through our normal legislative committee channels.

In one particular area in California where the Mare Island Naval Yard is located there is the community of Vallejo. There is no other industry in that community. The primary source of employment is the Mare Island Naval Yard. The school district in that community receives funds under the law which we passed last year. There are about 10,500 people working at the naval yard, and many of them would be eliminated from the provisions of this bill under the amendment that has now been offered.

Instead of our suddenly making a major, fundamental modification in the basic computation that we use in our whole formula under Public Law 874, and doing it in 5 minutes, it certainly seems to me we should give this problem the same study and the same consideration we gave when we passed Public Law 874 originally and that we have given to every amendment to it. Certainly that is the fair and proper thing from the standpoint of the school districts.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inform the distinguished gentleman that my subcommittee has at least three amendments to Public Law 874 pending now. As soon as I have disposed of the matters presently undertaken by the committee I will open hearings on the amendments to Public Law 874. If there is an amendment offered to modify and correct this, let me assure the author of the proposal and the entire membership of this House that it will have the same careful consideration the original Public Law 874 had in 1950. That will mean that there will be no bugs in it.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. UTT. The phrase in the amendment, "or pays taxes for school purposes," would cut California out of every nickel of this appropriation, because everybody in California pays sales taxes for school

purposes. That phrase would cut California out of every nickel because we have a sales tax for school purposes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman. I emphasize the point the gentleman from California has just made, that every district in the State of California under this amendment would be barred from getting a dime, because the State of California has a sales tax that applies directly to school purposes. Therefore, everybody under this amendment would be barred, and not a single district in California would get a cent from this appropriation. That just proves that anything affecting a fundamental formula in the detail that this amendment does should not be handled in 5 minutes on the House floor, it should be considered by the legislative committee in the usual way.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement on this matter and associate myself with him on it. Not only would this act be scuttled insofar as the expenses of the children in the impacted areas are concerned but, with all due respect to the author of the amendment, the amendment is illogical in itself. A Government employee comes in and buys a house in an impacted area and his children are covered, but if he rents a house his children are counted out immediately.

Something like that just is not logical. As the gentleman pointed out, you simply cannot legislate on an important and technical matter such as this in a few minutes on the floor of the House of Representatives during debate on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clear up the points raised by the gentleman from California. I believe the gentleman may have misinterpreted this amendment, or perhaps I have. As I understand the amendment—and I would be glad to be corrected by the author—it would only eliminate from consideration, in counting the number of pupils involved, those whose parents had been there over 5 years holding a Federal job of some kind. It would not have the effect of eliminating, as was suggested here, all of the children in California because they have a sales tax. As I read the amendment, or rather as I listened to it being read, it does not have anything to do with the tax method of the particular State or municipality involved. But I would like to have the author of the amendment clear that up for me, if I am mistaken about it.

Mr. TABER. The children involved are children of parents who have lived in the district 5 years or more. They would not be eligible for counting toward this gratuity.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I read the amendment, it says that for a period

of 5 years the parent may be employed and may pay a school tax on real estate or he may rent property on which a real-estate tax is paid for school purposes. Is it limited to real-estate taxes alone?

Mr. TABER. It does not say real estate taxes alone.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I propound this question. The State of Colorado has an income tax, a certain percentage of which is devoted to school purposes. Would the fact that any employee of the Federal Government had paid income taxes for a period of five years make his children ineligible to be counted to receive this money under Public Law 874? I wonder whether or not an individual in the State of Colorado who would pay an income tax which is partly used for school purposes and if they should pay that tax for a period of five years, would it then make the children of the income taxpayer ineligible to be counted to receive money under Public Law 874?

Mr. KEATING. I am not an expert and I rose for information myself. I would like to refer that question to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It would probably make them ineligible. Yes. But, maybe they should be made ineligible. It looks to me as if they should.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Let us go one step further. As the gentleman from California pointed out about the employees at a naval base in an impacted area, would the fact that they may have worked there for five years then make their children ineligible to be counted although they have contributed to the impact area.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean if they lived on government grounds?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No, if they live on government grounds you have one formula, but if they live outside of government grounds or if they are employed by the Federal Government and meet certain requirements, they are eligible. In my own district, we absorb 3 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In my own district we already absorb 3 percent, and that is the highest amount that can be absorbed under the setup, and yet we are eligible. The Federal Government owns in excess of \$25 million worth of property in the district alone. Surrounding my district, represented by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], there is a terrifically impacted area that will apply to this formula. The chances are 9 out of 10 it will ruin some of those school districts. As I read the amendment—and I have read it twice, so that at least I have some conception of what the gentleman is trying to do by the amendment—he says that for a period of 5 years any person employed by the Federal Government who may have children who were eligible to receive a part of this money, should no longer receive it if, first, he has

paid taxes on real estate, and second, he has paid rent to a real estate owner who, in turn, has paid taxes, then that individual should not be counted in the census in determining the amount of money that that particular school district would have. Then the additional question might arise, if you are going to limit it to taxes that have been paid for the use of a school district, then you have a lot of sales taxes and you have income taxes and you have many other taxes paid by the parent that would make the district ineligible. As heretofore pointed out, this is a complicated formula. It requires the secretary of a school district to make this ascertainment. How can they go about doing it? First, they would have to ascertain, does the individual own a piece of property, and, second, has he paid taxes on the same for the last 5 years, and, third, if he is a renter, then you must ascertain whether or not the person from whom he rented has paid taxes on that property. It puts an indeterminable burden on the school district and those who are trying to operate the schools to ascertain the facts, that would take them longer than is necessary for the district to receive the money.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think the gentleman has some merit in his argument. I was not aware of the last part of this amendment when I rose to ask a question about the payment of taxes. I had understood that the amendment was limited to the elimination of those children whose parents had been living in the district for 5 years, regardless of what taxes were paid there. I propose to offer an amendment to the amendment at the proper time to strike out this part about taxes. It seems to me it is sound to limit it to the elimination of children whose parents had been living there for a period of 5 years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In other words, as I understand, you are hopeful that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would recognize the impossibility of adequately carrying out Public Law 874, and you would then amend it to say that if an individual who is the parent of children in question who are counted to determine the amount that would be received, if that parent lived in the district for a period of at least 5 years, then that child should not be counted in the census. Is that what you had in mind?

Mr. KEATING. That is what I had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman—
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, after listening to two lawyers, pretty smart ones, too, I think, talk about this bill, I rose only to ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again so that some of the rest of us might form some opinion of it?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 18, line 10, after the period insert the following: "Provided, That none of the funds herein in this paragraph appropriated shall be paid to any school district on account of children whose parents have heretofore for 5 years or more lived in the district and paid taxes for school purposes or who pay rent to taxpayers for real property where they reside in such school district."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER: Strike out all the words after the words "lived in the district."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate.

The purpose of this amendment is to eliminate from consideration such a situation as has been referred to by various gentlemen from California and others and to confine this strictly to those cases where the parents have lived in the so-called impacted areas more than 5 years. Certainly it seems to me when we enacted this law we never intended that the children of Members of Congress in these adjoining districts should be counted in the impact which is made on that district for school purposes.

It is a simple amendment. I hope it will clear up some of the doubt expressed by a number of Members.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that under the gentleman's amendment if an employee of the Federal Government has lived in the impacted area for 5 years his children should not be counted in the census to determine whether or not the area should receive money under Public Law 874?

Mr. KEATING. That is the purpose.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman makes residence the only requirement. His amendment does not require that the parent pay taxes or that he pay rent to a real estate owner who in turn pays taxes as contemplated by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. No; it does not cover the taxation question at all; it is based upon living in the district.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is it consecutive or cumulative?

Mr. KEATING. It is for a period of 5 or more years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Suppose a family lived there 3 years, moved away, and after a lapse of time returned; would he have to live there 2 years or 5 years to fulfill the requirements of the amendment?

Mr. KEATING. In my judgment it would be 5 years of total residence in the district.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then the gentleman's answer is that 2 years after their return they would be ineligible to be counted; is that right?

Mr. KEATING. I would so interpret the amendment; it is worded in that way.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. One other question: Does the gentleman mean 1 or 2 parents of the children?

Mr. KEATING. The amendment is worded in the plural, "parents."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then both parents would have to live in the district?

Mr. KEATING. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. I wonder if the gentleman will ask the Clerk to read the amendment as it would be amended with the gentleman's wording.

Mr. KEATING. I have it right in front of me. Mr. TABER's would read, as amended:

None of the funds herein in this paragraph appropriated shall be paid to any school district on account of children whose parents have for 5 or more years heretofore lived in the district.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as amended, be now read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 10, after the period insert: "Provided, That none of the funds herein in this paragraph appropriated shall be paid to any school district on account of children whose parents have heretofore for 5 years or more lived in the district."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, is that the total amendment as now amended?

The CHAIRMAN. As amended.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I was going to try to get from the sponsor of the amendment an answer in response to the question of the gentleman from Colorado. He said he would interpret it to mean both parents would have to be there, presumably consecutively. We sometimes are faced with the problem with servicemen that move into an impacted area, a husband, wife, and one child, we will say, they are there for 3 years, then the man is ordered overseas for 2 years. I presume that would suspend the running of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would not interpret it that way. I would interpret the amendment to mean that if at any time, regardless of the period of time heretofore the parents had lived in that district, they would come under this ban. It would not necessarily mean a consecutive 5 years. They could have lived there 20 years ago for 5 years, then moved back into the district and have gone to work in a defense plant.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman said it would not mean consecutive. A good analogy would be the act of acquisition of property by adverse possession.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the Committee has an example before it of an attempt to legislate on an appropriation bill, even though it comes within the provision of limitation on an appropriation bill. Some of the possibilities that have been brought up in regard to these amendments and amendments as amended indicate the lack of wisdom in proceeding along this course. I think the illustration is apparent enough to the House that no further debate is needed that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not true, for example, that if there are two school districts adjoining a base, the people would move from one to the other. If they lived in one district for a time, they would move over to the other. It proves very clearly what the gentleman has been pointing out that this is no place to legislate on a basic piece of legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On a very complicated bill that needs the attention of the legislative committee in order that all of these probabilities and possibilities might be explored and in order that the House might be able to work its will. I agree with the gentleman from California a vote in favor of this amendment would be the endorsement of a provision which is ambiguous and which is not clear to the House at this time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to direct a question to the author of the amendment. Will this amendment apply to children whose parents live in Public Housing Administration projects, old Lanham Act projects within a school district which are owned by the Government and for which no taxes are paid? In the city of Alameda we are still using some of these old Lanham Act projects for this type of housing, where the people are already living in houses owned by the Federal Government and pay no local taxes to the local communities. Will they be exempted, or will you accept an amendment exempting those people from being counted in this?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman points out another possibility. I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

IF ATTEMPTING TO COMPLY WITH THE CONSTITUTION AND CONTINUING TO GUARANTEE TRIAL BY JURY IS "HAM,"—I AM FOR MORE OF IT

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, Drew Pearson's column carried a story about a "hamstringing" amendment, as he calls it, to the civil rights bill that was defeated in the Judiciary Committee of the House of which I am a member by a vote of 15 to 17—so he says—but he purposely does not state what the amendment was. It was an amendment to guarantee trial by jury under title 18, civil rights statutes now in existence and those proposed by this bill.

The amendment, which I would like to read, provides for the right of trial by jury and says:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of the rules of procedure of the United States district courts, in all cases of contempt arising in any proceeding under this act, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed.

This section shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice.

Under title 18 of the United States Code, persons are entitled to a jury trial when tried in criminal contempt cases except where the United States is a party to the action. It is the admitted purpose of the bill voted by the committee to provide that the Attorney General shall bring actions against individuals in the name of the United States—and under title 18 procedures—people would be denied the right of trial by jury. The amendment, which I supported, would have retained the right of trial by jury which is a basic right three times spelled out in the Constitution. It would have provided for the same procedure of trial by jury guaranteed everyone on matters criminal in nature, whether by contempt or other judicial process.

Congress has recognized in the past, and has provided as with labor legislation, the Norris-LaGuardia Act as an example, that even though the United States was a party to an action, the defendant in any given labor dispute would be guaranteed his constitutional and basic right of trial by jury. Thus, Congress showed in this instance, where labor was

involved, a clear grasp of the results of providing for contempt proceedings and, in recognizing that without a specific provision providing for trial by jury where the United States is a party such a trial would be denied the accused, has made specific provision for trial by jury. Can it be said that Congress would not be equally vigilant and jealous of this basic right in the instant at hand than where labor was involved? Should we deny to municipal and State officials, school officials, public servants the basic right we have taken cognizance of in labor legislation?

I believe it essential that, as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, as a Member of Congress who has sworn to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the land, I continue to fight for this basic right of trial by jury and I intend to do so. And if, as it has been suggested, this is "ham," then I'm for more of it.

CAN WE IN AMERICA AFFORD NOT TO SPEND THIS MUCH MONEY?

(Mr. SHELLEY, at the request of Mr. FOGARTY, was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate over the last 3 days with a great deal of interest because of my personal knowledge during the years I served the labor movement in California of the many worthwhile activities of the Department of Labor and in later years the programs administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It has been going through my mind that in analyzing this bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee, we should all consider just what we are getting for the taxpayers dollar and what we might lose should some of the amendments as offered be finally passed by the House. First of all, let me pay my respects and offer my commendation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and respected Representative from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY.] This subcommittee has labored long hours over this measure, as we on the Appropriations Committee know so well, and they have brought forth a measure designed to perform the services obligated to the Department by action of this body and I am sure we all realize here today the immense amount of humanitarian services contained in the responsibility of these departments.

Now, as to the benefits of this particular operation of our Government. And during this review, I believe we should all think to ourselves "Can we in America afford not to spend this much money?"

First, there is the matter of public assistance grants to the States distributed by the Social Security Administration. This amounts to \$1,700,000,000.

There is in this budget about \$550 million for the Public Health Service or about \$3 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This has built thousands of hospitals, conducted medical research, has provided grants to States to fight tuberculosis and vene-

real diseases and communicable diseases, and has worked on health problems of the American Indian.

Let us not forget in particular the great work the National Institutes of Health is doing in the fields of cancer and heart research. Federal money has helped support the work which led to the discovery of the Salk vaccine. Today, we know much more about heart diseases, more about mental health, more about cancer and its terrifying ramifications. I personally know of some of the great work being done in research on heart disease. I pray that some of the budget-cutters at work these days with their nibbling away at this particular measure will never be struck by crippling and disabling diseases that maybe some few dollars for added research might help in changing the pattern of these diseases as the discovery of Salk vaccine has done to polio.

The rest of the programs of spending tax dollars under the labor and welfare budget are: Apprenticeship and training programs, study of problems affecting the aged, grants for school construction, vocational rehabilitation, the school-lunch program for 12 million children and maternal and child health services and aid to crippled children. Sure, all of these programs cost money but just what is this amount in the whole picture. It is 5 percent of the total national budget and just 1 percent of our national income. To me this is a small price to pay for a happy, contented, and healthy American nation.

Of course a lot of us are disturbed about the size of this huge budget. But, let's not forget our responsibilities are huge today and also our capabilities are huge in this great and active economy of ours. For just a minute let us just take a look at what makes up our budget, as I know you all are so well aware:

	Billion
National defense (includes atomic energy).....	\$41.3
Mutual security (military and economic).....	4.8
Interest on debt.....	7.4
Veterans' benefits.....	5.0
Agriculture.....	5.0
Labor and welfare.....	3.5
Commerce and housing.....	1.8
Natural resources.....	1.5
General government.....	1.5

So what does this list of figures mean? It means that 65 cents of every tax dollar is going to build up our own defenses and those of our allies in order to deter international communism. I for one have been thinking long and hard just where we are to cut this budget for 1958 that the President tells us we must cut, but doesn't tell us where to cut. The budget that the Secretary of the Treasury says could bring such a depression that it would "curl your hair." Well, for the information of the Secretary, there are many soft spots right now in the economy of our land: Just recently, General Motors announced that they have ordered an indefinite suspension of their program to build a mammoth new assembly plant hiring more than 4,000 people down in Sunnyvale, south of San Francisco.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker; we may be unhappily surprised at the end of this fiscal year when the revenue is stacked against the outgo. But the important question here in my mind remains, Where can we cut this budget?

It seems to me that this Congress must take a long look into the expenditures for our national defense and those moneys that are being asked to support programs of mutual security and foreign aid. Let us stop now giving and approving programs for these neutralist nations that have been playing footsie with the Communist bloc for so long. This to me does not look like an investment likely to pay off in big dividends, but maybe in big bombs. We are asked to aid King Saud, Tito, Gomulka, maybe even Nasser, and more to Nehru. Lord knows where this money is going and how it is being used by our generosity and humanitarian actions in offering aid to these particular foreign countries. And in the field of national defense we are met by cries of "national security, classified and not for public information." I cannot here pass expert judgment on the budget for the Defense Department, and its proper use of the Military Establishment. But certainly we stack 5 percent up against 65 percent, is it any wonder that, as some of us feel, we are being foolish in chipping away in amounts of 30 and 20 thousand dollars?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] on his remarks regarding adequate staff assistance for the Appropriations Committee.

The members of the Appropriations Committee are served today by very able and devoted assistants, but how can these few staff people compete in analysis and information gathering against the gargantuan staff of the Bureau of the Budget, numbering some 400 people. It has long been my hope that we could create in this House an expanded staff of professional investigators working on a year-round basis constantly available for special assignment and direction by the committee to go into the multitude of fiscal problems and operations of the departments downtown. Only in this way will the House receive complete and adequate information from sources reporting to the House and not to the executive branch.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, have attempted to point up some of the vast amounts of possibilities we are faced with in trying to trim this massive budget presented to us for 1958. Let us face up to the fact that the services the departments we are appropriating for today offer to the American taxpayer real benefits and that reduction of the budget will only occur through reducing those items of such amounts that really make up this budget—the military and foreign-aid items. And in closing, do not let us forget that many of those who are screaming the loudest for cuts have been those who have furthered the high-interest policies of this Government which have added almost a half billion dollars to the interest costs of the Federal Government.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 3, 1957
For actions of April 2, 1957
85th-1st, No. 57

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....18	Labor.....32	Property.....26
Appropriations.....3	Lands.....10,25	Public works.....34
Budget.....13	Law.....29	Reclamation.....12,28
Claims.....5	Livestock.....30	Roads.....22
Contracts.....32	Loans.....8	Soil bank.....18
Corn.....2,9	Marketing.....1,30	Soil conservation.....6
Dairy marketing.....17	Peanuts.....24	Surplus food.....15
Farm program.....16	Personnel.....5,23,31	Trade, foreign.....7
Flood control.....34	Postal rates.....21	Transportation.....33
Forestry.....25	Poultry.....14,18	Water pollution.....19
Government.....4	Prices.....20	Wheat.....18,35
Imports.....27	support.....2	Wool.....11

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported marketing facilities loan bill. Rep. Coad urged USDA to increase corn price supports. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Reps. Cramer and Mathews introduced and Rep. Cramer discussed bill to eliminate green peanuts from marketing quotas. President approved durum wheat bill.

HOUSE

1. MARKETING FACILITIES. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 4504, to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities (H. Rept. 292). p. 4461
2. CORN. Rep. Coad urged higher price supports for corn, and criticized this Department for not replying to the petition he sent to the Secretary calling for 1957 corn price supports at \$1.60 per bushel. pp. 4458-59
3. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 4427-57). Rep. Gavin expressed the hope that the USDA appropriation bill will be screened as closely for reductions when it comes before the House as has the Labor-HEW appropriation bill (pp. 4434-35).
4. GOVERNMENT. Rep. Hiestand spoke in favor of legislation to curb the centralization of power in the Federal Government at the expense of the States. p. 4426
5. PERSONNEL; CLAIMS. Received from GSA a proposed bill to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment; to Judiciary Committee. p. 4461

6. SOIL CONSERVATION. Received from the Secretary of the Army a report on Bastrop-Fayette Soil Conservation District, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act. p. 4461
7. FOREIGN TRADE. Received a Nevada Legislature memorial urging that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act be permitted to expire on June 30, 1953. p. 4462
8. LOANS. The Veterans' Affairs Committee voted 11 to 6 not to report H.R. 6359 and 6360, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe a rate of interest on guaranteed, insured, and direct loans of not more than 5 percent per annum. p. D278

SENATE

9. CORN. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported (Apr. 1) without amendment S. 1771, by Sen. Humphrey, to provide for a 1957 corn-base acreage of 51 million acres (S. Rept. 198). p. 4304
10. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered favorably reported with amendment S. J. Res. 12, providing for transfer of right of way for Yellowtail dam and reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, and payment to the Crow Indian tribe in connection therewith. p. D276
11. WOOL FUTURES. This office has a few copies (for reference and lending purposes) of a staff study, issued by the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee (as a "committee print") on the wool and wool top futures market. The report provides information on several aspects of the futures market, with particular reference to volume of trading, speculative and hedging commitments, prices, and other factors pertinent to trading activity.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. RECLAMATION. Rep. Gavin inserted a speech by Col. Sprague of the Corps of Engineers, on the Allegheny River Reservoir project. pp. A2635-8
13. BUDGET. Rep. Roosevelt commented "I want to emphasize that there are many ways to combat inflation--a cut in Government spending is only one approach and often not the wisest one," and inserted a letter from the Western division of the National Postal Transport Ass'n, urging restoration of the budget cuts made in postal operations. pp. A2641-2
14. POULTRY. Rep. Sullivan stated "many of us in the House of Representatives feel that a mandatory poultry inspection law will not adequately protect consumers and poultry workers unless it provides for some form of mandatory ante mortem or before-slaughtering inspection," commented that technical personnel of the Department testified differently concerning this inspection than political appointees, and inserted a news story on the House hearings on poultry inspection bills. pp. A2643-4
15. SURPLUS FOOD. Rep. Breeding inserted an editorial alleging that food surpluses were bound to disappear with the continual reduction in farm acreage for factories, homes, and other improvements. pp. A2644-5
16. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Coad inserted an editorial stating "It is hard to imagine the ill-will that this man Benson has against him in this area," and urging that the facts of the farm problem be presented to the city people and the legislatures. p. A2649

sue his course further, the status of the United Nations will be irreparably damaged. The time has come for us to act.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Anderson,	Durham	Lipscomb
Mont.	Eberharter	Magnuson
Aspinall	Evins	Norrell
Barrett	Frelinghuysen	Powell
Bowler	Gray	Prouty
Collier	Green, Penn.	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Tenn.	Gregory	Schwengel
Dies	Holtzman	
Diggs	LeCompte	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 10 on page 18. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to bring to the attention of the members of the Committee an article that appeared in one of the newspapers written by the well-known columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, in regard to the President's budget.

As you know, we have been trying to keep the record straight. We reminded the Committee last Wednesday of what the President had to say in his press conference about his budget. Then last Friday the Secretary of Labor reminded you that we were going too far and making foolish cuts. Again, on yesterday, we quoted from a press release of the man who heads the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Folsom. He objected to the cuts that you made in the

last week, especially to the Food and Drug Administration, and warned you against attempts to make further cuts in Public Health and in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Then I noticed in the New York Times this morning that some of our friends on the Republican side have now apparently seen the light. I quote from one section of the New York Times, where it says:

Meanwhile, in the House a Republican leader of the drive to cut funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare showed signs of wavering today under administration pressure for the House to approve the full amount for the Food and Drug Administration. He said he was not going to fight a Democratic move to restore \$1,300,000 cut from the Food and Drug Administration by the amendment that he offered last week.

I hope that the New York Times has quoted my friend from North Carolina correctly and I hope when the roll is called on this amendment that many others will see the light and follow his leadership and admit that they had made a mistake.

But today in the Post we have an article by one whom I think you will all agree is a very conservative newspaper man, Walter Lippmann. He says:

In talking about the budget at his press conference last Wednesday, the President exonerated himself from the untenable position he had taken before. Then he was saying, so Congress and the rest of us had supposed, that the budget was too high, that he would like to see it reduced but that since only Congress could reduce it, it was their responsibility, not his, to revise the budget. This general understanding of what he believed was, of course, heavily influenced by the famous press conference in which Secretary Humphrey had spoken so harshly of the President's budget.

After several weeks of confusion, the President has changed his position, and he has now made himself the defender and the advocate of his own budget. Whatever one may think of the budget, this is a sounder attitude, both legally and morally, than his earlier one.

Under existing law the President is obligated to present a budget which he believes in and is prepared to justify and defend. The law (title I, ch. 31 of the United States Code) says that "the President shall transmit * * * to the Congress the budget which sets forth * * * estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary in his judgment for the support of the Government." Until last week's press conference, what we had instead was a budget which the Secretary of the Treasury said was too high, which the President said could be reduced if the Congress would repeal or would amend some of the great spending programs which Congress—and apparently Congress alone—had enacted.

In order to justify this alarming abdication of the Executive authority, the President pictured himself as a humble servant of Congress whose orders he is carrying out. "We have worked many months on the development of the budget," he said on March 13, "and each item in there has been developed with the idea of performing to the very best of our ability the responsibilities laid on the executive department by Congress for carrying out its mandates." Congress, he asserted, has ordered a number of great programs which cost money, and there cannot be any great cuts in the budget until and unless Congress votes for the cutting out or the elimination or slowing up, at least, of some of these great programs.

This was a strange picture of how the Government happens to be engaged in the great programs that cost so much money. Are they really the work of Congress alone, initiated in Congress, developed in Congress, with the President waiting hat in hand at the door of Congress for his orders? Any one who thought this was a true and candid picture of the origin and character of the great spending programs has only to recall the President's messages to Congress, the platform on which he ran for President, the proud campaign speeches he made about the record of his administration.

The President's first position on the budget was untenable, as the reaction in Congress and in the country made quite evident. Last week, in a not-very-happy mood, he made himself the champion of his own budget.

The country, or at least a large and vocal part of it, is startled by the size of the budget. Is the size of it really startling? It is startling, but only when it is measured by the campaign promises of 1952, especially the promises made by General Eisenhower after his famous covenant on Morningside Heights with Senator Taft. But measured by the campaign promises of 1956, when the President adopted the philosophy of the new Republicanism, the President is entitled to say, as he is now saying, that the budget proposes to carry out conservatively what the voters have been promised.

The crux of the matter is that between 1952 and 1956 the President committed himself to the "great programs" which cost so much. At the same time he was compelled because of the state of the cold war to have a great program of military defense.

When General Eisenhower ran for office in 1952, he felt able to offer big promises of reduced expenditures because he made two assumptions. One assumption was that he could end the war in Korea, and that this would be followed by a peace which permitted important reductions in the military spending. His other assumption was that he could stop the expansion of, and even cut back considerably, the grants and subsidies of the welfare programs.

The basic difference between the orthodox Republicans and the Eisenhower or new Republicans is over these two assumptions. The orthodox Republicans still believe in these two assumptions whereas the President does not.

Thus the orthodox believe that much money can be saved, especially out of what now goes to foreign aid, by a more isolationist foreign policy. The President, on the other hand, believes in collective security, which cannot be made to work without subsidies to foreign countries.

The orthodox believe also that the welfare measures can be reduced, and that a lot of money can thus be saved. The President and the new Republicans have become convinced that the party cannot win elections unless it is able to attract those large blocs of voters who had become an invincible coalition under Franklin Roosevelt.

The President's budget is not a series of great programs commanded by Congress. The budget is the new Republicanism, in this time of unabated cold war, when translated into dollars. It is what it is because of decisions made deliberately by President Eisenhower himself, and the Congress has been well justified in insisting that he take the responsibility, be it to defend the budget or to say where it should be reduced.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to respond to the comment made by the chairman of the subcommittee. Although he did not refer to me by name, he did refer to an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole last

Thursday, I believe, by a margin of 1 vote.

I do not know what the New York Times said. The gentleman from Rhode Island quotes from various newspapers of the country every day as he opens the discussion of the bill. He also frequently quotes various individuals in Government, as if we should make up our minds how we should vote on amendments by what somebody else says outside of this body. I do not know what course the gentleman from Rhode Island follows, and I do not have any right to question how he votes or why he votes as he does; but I would like to say that in my own case I vote according to the dictates of my own conscience.

Some reference was made in the quotation the gentleman read from the New York paper about administration pressure. Let me say publicly that I have not been subjected to any pressure from the administration or from any executive department of the Government or from any source whatsoever concerning this bill. No one has been in touch with me about the amendment. I have not had any communications about it by word, letter, telegram, or otherwise before or since it was adopted.

I was called on the telephone by a newspaper reporter last Saturday and he advised me that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had issued a statement for publication Monday morning in which some comments were made about the amendment which had been adopted in the Committee of the Whole dealing with appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration, the burden of which comment was that the cut the Committee had made would destroy the effectiveness of the Food and Drug Administration. He asked me if I wished to comment on the Secretary's statement and, as I recall, whether I intended putting up a fight against restoration of the funds. I replied that I did not intend to fight over that amendment; that it was just one of a score of amendments that have been adopted and will be offered.

The amendment reduced the budget request by \$1,327,000 to \$7,973,000, which is \$1,194,000 more than they had for 1957. I do not see how an increase of more than a million dollars above funds available in 1957 could cripple or hamstring the operations. Indeed, such an increase would permit an expansion of activities. Remember they only had \$6,779,000 in 1957 and will have \$7,973,000 if the amendment stands up.

I said also, and would like to repeat, that I do not have any desire to cripple the activities of the Food and Drug Administration. I think it serves a very important function and am in favor of providing adequate funds. As I see it, the question simply is whether we should increase the funds over 1957 by \$2½ million, as the bill originally did, or whether an increase of \$1,194,000 over 1957 should be sufficient for 1958.

As to how the Members vote when the Committee rises and we go back into the House, that is a matter for each Member to decide for himself. I do not intend to put up any fight for the amend-

ment and will not undertake to persuade any Member. If the House sustains the amendment, I believe the funds available will be sufficient. But if the House reverses the action of the Committee of the Whole, I will be satisfied with that decision. It is simply a matter of judgment which each Member should decide for himself without pressure from any source. I repeat that no pressure has been directed at me from any source.

I would have been content if the Committee had rejected the amendment and did not appeal from the voice vote when the Chairman announced the amendment had been defeated; and it was not I who asked for the teller vote which reversed the voice vote.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is my first voyage to the well of the House. So, if I make any mistakes, I hope you will bear with me, and I have been listening patiently to the chairman of this Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have never missed a caucus call and I have always been here at the kickoff time, and I have listened attentively every minute and every hour of the time that the chairman of this committee has been on the floor. I want to commend him for his diligence. I want to commend him for his industry. Although he has been talking for some 5 days and doing a job of it along the lines, it seems much longer to me. Maybe that is my imagination. Until I came to the House of Representatives, I was a trial lawyer. I work hard. I never get an opportunity to sit back there on the jury. So I have been 1 of a group of some 425 Congressmen, sitting back there in those comfortable seats, on those cushions, and I have been listening to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]—if I say "Rock Island," try to be patient. I want to talk about the gentleman from that wonderful State of Rhode Island. Time after time he has been talking, and every time he points to the Republican side. I would assume, that by word, innuendo, and veiled threats, telling us, "Don't you do this. If you try to do this you will do the wrong thing. You authorized this appropriation in the 81st Congress, the 82d Congress, and the 83d Congress and you appropriated the money in that Congress. The amount of money that we are appropriating here is only about the same amount of money you appropriated in the 84th Congress, and if you do this, this service will die." That is the inference, is it not? My worthy colleague, is that it? You do not have to reply now. I have not given you the time. I am only asking you a question and you can get time to reply later. You are chairman of the committee. I have some other things I want to tell you before I sit down.

I sat back there and listened to you and I was trying to analyze what you were. I was trying to figure out whether you were a lawyer. For a while I thought you were. Then I listened to you talk a little longer and then I said, "Maybe he is a businessman." "No," I said, "he is not a businessman." All this time I was talking to myself. Then I went back

there and I asked him, and I found out you are a bricklayer. You are a leader in the bricklayers union. Do not think I am criticizing bricklayers, because you belong to an honorable profession. Some of my best friends back in Chicago are bricklayers. You point over to this side of the House and you would think the only working men in the United States of America were over on your side. You talk as though the only spokesmen in the United States are on the Democratic side of this House. What do you think my father was? He was a member of organized labor. For 30 years an electrical worker. You do not have a chance to answer me yet.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I think the Chair should instruct the gentleman that when he refers to another Member he should refer to him in the third person.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that rule be suspended for the remainder of the debate on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must state that he is here to enforce the rules.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BYRNE] has the floor and he has not yielded.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I have a little order? May the aisles be cleared?

As a trial lawyer, my worthy colleague from Rhode Island—did I do it right?—Well, while I am on my feet I want to enter a plea of "not guilty" to anything that you did or any of my worthy colleagues did, or any of the colleagues who have passed away, or any who were not elected in the last election, because I have got a defense to anything that my colleagues—I almost said "you"—that my colleagues did in the 84th Congress or in the Congress preceding it, because I just got here. I do not expect to roll down the thunder from the skies and do something that you did not do—pardon me—my worthy colleagues did not do. I do not expect to do that, but I say to you, you said it was a precedent—I beg your pardon—I beg your pardon. I thank you for the admonition. My worthy colleagues, or some of them, said all of the President's appropriations to this time—and when you talk here in the well of the House about children, it seems to me that the worthy gentleman from Rhode Island should be reminded that I raised 8 children without any help from the Government and through the years encountered all of the problems encountered in raising a large family.

In previous sessions of Congress programs have been started that they claim are for our welfare but which are actually destroying our financial independence and security. These social planners are milking us dry. I will vote economy cuts wherever possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BYRNE], refused to yield to me when he had the floor. I have never refused to yield to him or anybody else on that side during this debate, and I will keep this up during the rest of the debate, no matter how long the debate goes on.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not have the floor right now. I would yield if I had the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the gentleman's questions. The answer to the first question he raised is this: The only thing I am trying to do is to have you and your colleagues live up to the promises that were made by you and your party in the last campaign and not renege on the promises you made in the last campaign by following the Republican leadership in this House and cutting these appropriations as you have been doing during the past week. That is all I am trying to do, to have you live up to the promises that you and your party made to the voters of the country and your district when you agreed to go out and support President Eisenhower and his program.

And another thing I was trying to do was to find out who are the orthodox Republicans and who are the Eisenhower Republicans on your side of the aisle. Are you with the President or against him?

Now as for the second question the gentleman raised, it did not take me long to ascertain what profession my distinguished friend from Illinois represented. It has often been said that we have too many lawyers in politics, but I would never make that statement myself. I have, however, always wanted to let everybody know, I may say to my distinguished friend from Illinois, that it does not make any difference to me what a person's station in life might be. When they ask me what mine was I have always been proud to say I was a bricklayer. I was a bricklayer for 10 years and I will always be proud of it no matter how you seek to belittle bricklayers or anyone else who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow.

There is one trait in my nature which the record will show ran through my career as a bricklayer and my career as a Member of Congress as well. That trait is being honest with my fellow workers and employers when I was a bricklayer and being honest with my colleagues and constituents as a Member of this body. I did not whistle one tune during my campaign for office and

another on the floor here today, as a great many are doing on the other side of the aisle. And it is entirely possible that the consistent positions I have taken in regard to legislation like this is due to my association with bricklayers and others who work with their hands.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. GROSS. To demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assistance for school construction: For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title III and title IV of the act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14; 70 Stat. 909, 968-969), including not to exceed \$700,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies and not to exceed \$5 million for title IV, \$41,700,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I share the feelings of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BYRNE] for the simple reason that the chairman of the subcommittee has been continually telling the Republicans about the promises we have failed to live up to. If we are going to talk about promises, let us look at the record, let us note just a few things that the Democrats have promised, and what they have not lived up to in the many years they have been in control of the Congress.

The gentleman from Rhode Island and his Democrat Party in 1948 promised the people in every election since then, in every congressional election and every presidential election that they would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

If you are going to point the finger of accusation, let me remind you that you have controlled the Congress 8 out of the past 10 years. Where is your action to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act?

In like manner you have promised up and down this land that you were going to do something for small business. In every congressional election your party has promised tax relief for the small-business man. Despite your control of the Congress for so many years relief for small business is conspicuous by its absence. Where is your relief for small business? You have made many, many promises but there have been very, very few performances.

Since I cast my first vote in 1932 I have continuously heard the Democrats talk about civil rights. In 21 out of the last 25 years the Democrats have controlled the Congress. Where are the civil-rights laws? Where are the performances on the civil-rights promises? The basic division within the Democrat Party prevents any performance on the above promises and many other promises.

The gentleman and many of his colleagues keep telling us on this side of

the aisle about the division within the Republican Party. How about your own division? How about separating the northern Democrats from the southern Democrats and showing us who runs the Democrat Party? How about showing us the division involving some 80 Members of this House who signed the so-called liberal manifesto and I understand that this group has not consulted with their official leader in the House, Speaker RAYBURN?

What are the so-called liberals in the Democrat Party proposing to do? Look at your spending program. Why, this \$72 billion budget will be peanuts if you tried to do what the liberal program outlines. We would not alone have Federal aid to education, but you would have everybody working for the Government and on the Government payroll, we would have socialization, we would have nothing but big labor and big Government.

You Democrats talk about the separation we have over here in our party, but look at your own party since 1932 and the promises that you made. So I say this with all due deference to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY, I feel that in a discussion of this kind you should not always refer to the division over here unless in good Christian charity and in good conscience you point out the division on your side. I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] would get a lot more votes if he would not continuously point out our particular division over here, when, in my estimation he had a much deeper division within his own party in the division between the Democrat liberals and conservatives, between northern and southern Democrats, between CIO followers and opponents of Walter Reuther.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am pleased to note that the gentleman from Rhode Island is giving the Republicans credit for the effort being made to get some economy into our Government; but I wonder whether he isn't forgetting which party is in majority control of the House of Representatives?

Mr. SHEEHAN. The gentleman is so right. The Democrats control every committee, they can do what they want. They can tell the people what they want to do and they can do it.

We may have modern Republicans over here, but I want little part of this newly coined concept. I am a constitutional conservative and I am proud of that fact.

Your Democrat Party has many good staunch conservatives who want to protect the Constitution that was given to us by our forefathers and who want to protect the country that has been handed down to us through the years.

Therefore, if any member of the Democrat Party wants to castigate the divisions in the Republican Party let him in all fairness just point out the deeper and more basic divisions within the Democrat Party.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not given to criticizing my brethren here on the floor, but I regard this bill as a very important matter. Yesterday I had some rather important engagements and, of course, I had a pretty tough time trying to get to them and get back here because it was about 2 hours before we ever started any business on the floor of the House.

It is now 1 o'clock and we have been in session for an hour. I believe the average Member on the floor would greatly appreciate our trying to put aside the type of debate that is going on and let us get down to the bill itself. I enjoy a little sideplay once in a while, but I am afraid we have been on this bill now long enough and with a little cooperation we can save some time and get down to business. I am not being critical of my distinguished friend from Rhode Island. I think maybe all of us have contributed a little to this sideplay. I do hope this slight suggestion will help us move along a little bit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; and cooperative research, surveys, and demonstrations in education as authorized by the act of July 26, 1954 (20 U. S. C. 331-332); \$7 million, of which not less than \$550,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 17, page 19, down through line 22.

The CHAIRMAN. Beginning where?

Mr. HIESTAND. This language:

Provided, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to the said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

We would redistribute the money, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is definitely legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. This was only an attempt to have the States reimburse

the Federal Government for the technical assistance that the States call on the Department of Education to give. Now, if you want it all to come out of the Federal Treasury and not have the States make this reimbursement, this is the way to do it. It is clearly subject to a point of order, and I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the language in the bill and sustains the point of order.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORN of South Carolina: On page 19, line 15, strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$5,518,000."

(Mr. DORN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk the last few days about the march of time, about the clock moving around, and about progress. I have listened very intently to the debate, particularly about our growth and our increase in population. The argument is that we should increase Government spending solely because of a growing population.

Over the last few hours I have done some research on the population phase of this debate. Several people have contacted me from back home about our growth in population and offered that as a reason why we should not curtail some of these appropriations in this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, in 1937 there were in America 128 million people. Today there are approximately 168 million people. Twenty years from now, in the year 1977, there will be in this country 224 million people. The national income of the American people in 1936 was \$65 billion. Our national income as of last year was \$342 billion. In 1976, 20 years from last year, our total national income will be \$1.4 trillion.

But, oh, yes, my colleagues, here is the story the population argument has failed to tell. The total cost of the Federal budget in 1938 was \$6,150,000,000. Today, as proposed in this budget, it is \$72 billion, an increase of 1,050 percent over the budget of 1938, whereas the population increase of the country has only been 31 percent. And, if we project that into the future another 20 years, the total national budget of this country will be \$753 billion, an increase of 1,050 percent over that of today, whereas your population figure of 224 million will only be an increase of 33 percent. The national budget in 1938 was only 9 percent of the national income of the American people. Today it is near 20 percent. If the Federal budget increases by the same proportion in the next 20 years then the budget for 1978 will be 51 percent of our national income. Mr. Chairman, this is a conservative estimate. And if you project that still further you will find that high school boys and girls in America today will live to see the day when the expenditures of the Federal Government—and I want some of my good friends over here to listen to this—the boys and girls in high

school today will live to see the expenditures of the Federal Government equal the entire gross national income of the people of this country. Long before these two meet, freedom will have passed from this land.

You may call us reactionary, if you please, but I stand here today as a liberal, a man believing in the working people of America, believing in the small-salaried men and women of America who are crying today from the grassroots of this country for a sound dollar. We have before this session of the 85th Congress the opportunity to give the small-business people of this country, to give the teachers, to give the workingmen two raises: One, a sound dollar, which will give him more purchasing power, which will give him the power to buy more goods and stimulate business; and then on the other hand, if we continue to hold down this budget, we can give him another raise in the not too distant future, a tax reduction. Then you will have put this country on a sound basis. We will have saved the people from Federal despotism and exploitation.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to you today that it was the ordinary people who paid the taxes in France who rose up during the French Revolution against the ever-increasing expenditures of an autocratic Federal bureaucracy under Louis XVI. At that time 50 percent of the people's income in France was being taken by the Government. And the same kind of revolution, not violent, but peaceful, is brewing in America today, among the taxpayers out at the grassroots, among the little businesses, the small farmers, the laboring people, against this ever-increasing, ever more powerful Federal hierarchy.

The day has come when the Members of this Congress should stand up and be counted, to give the American people a sound dollar, to give them more purchasing power. Can you point to me, my friends over here in this section of the House, one single instance in the history of the world when a government became more centralized, when it grew too topheavy, but that the ordinary people in their prosaic walks of life did not suffer a loss of liberty, a loss of income from that ever growing, ever more powerful centralized authority? The history of the world will prove that to be true. And those of us here today who are trying to hold the line are the true liberals, believing with Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our great Democratic Party, that the least governed are the best governed.

The very foundation stones of this country were laid down by our forefathers in the interest of all the people and not for the benefit of an ever growing, more powerful Federal autocracy seeking more money—from whom? From the citizens of this country who make up our body politic, and who are the source of our strength and the end of our responsibility. My responsibility here today is not to the ever growing, ever more powerful Federal autocracy, but to the people of this country who are paying the bill. Let us stand up today and give them two raises, a sound dollar and eventually a decrease in taxes.

This amendment which I have offered here today cuts back this item for salaries and expenses to the level of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1957 plus \$248,000.

What does this particular part of this bill do? It creates investigations, jobs and boards. Here are some of the things they do: These boards will coordinate libraries and conduct surveys. They will travel abroad and exchange educational information. They will prepare studies on education in underdeveloped countries in the Slavic countries and of higher education in the Far East. They want to investigate vandalism in high schools, and to prepare models of school buildings to exchange with foreign countries.

As the son of a superintendent of education, and as the son of a mother who taught school for 32 years, at the same time raising 10 children, my observation is that the architects in the local communities and the local school boards are the ones to handle the school affairs of this country. I see in this particular phase of this bill a great danger to the educational system of this country. They are going out and investigating vandalism in the high schools. Investigations? It has an "s" after "investigation." How many investigations we do not know. Exchanging information with foreign countries. The architects of this country know how to draw school buildings. I know of no case in this country where they do not have the brains locally to draw the models of their schools. But here we are appropriating money to go out and investigate, and exchange information with foreign nations and between the States.

"Coordination" is another term they use to cover up vast expenditures of your money and the money of the taxpayers of this country.

We must draw the line somewhere, because some day, some time, somewhere, the argument of my so-called liberal friends notwithstanding, you will find the taxpayers of this country working for the Federal Government, and I might say to my good friends here, when that day comes, call it what you will, you will have complete and tee total national socialism in this country if not complete communism. Let us today start with this appropriation and continue through the entire budget until we save the American people from future slavery to an all-consuming arrogant, stupendous Federal autocracy.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will do just a little bit more than my friend from South Carolina says it will do. It will cut the appropriation back further than the amount they had available in 1957. The Department of Education here in Washington for some reason or other has been neglected for some years now. Two years ago in the report we issued in the 84th Congress, related to fiscal 1956, we had this to say:

The Office of Education always enjoyed a degree of autonomy within the Federal Security Agency, and when the Federal Security Agency was given departmental status as the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare, the Congress was assured that it would not result in any change in the status of the Office of Education.

We have attempted to keep that autonomy for the Office of Education and the Public Health Service.

We said in our report at that time:

The committee feels very strongly that we ought to have an Office of Education that is effective and one that the education authorities all over the country would have pride in and would look to for leadership and for assistance in their problems.

In practically every State of the Union the educational leaders are looking to Washington for some sort of assistance as far as education is concerned.

As a result of that promise to the Office of Education, this committee invited the Office of Education a year ago to come in with a proposal for a substantial raise in their funds for education; and they did. This year they followed out our request again and came in for another increase. Let me tell you some of the things this is going to disturb, and I know the gentleman does not intend to do so, but it is going to have that effect. It cannot have any other effect. If you remember, 2 years ago I brought to the attention of this House the problem of the mentally retarded child in this country, the problem of mental retardation. I told you at that time there were about 4 million to 5 million people who are mentally retarded in this country, and no one was paying any attention to them. So without consulting the Bureau of the Budget or the President this committee put \$750,000 into the Institute on Neurology to start a research program in this field. We asked the Office of Education to come up the following year with a program in education that would see to it that the educable child who has some form or some degree of mental retardation or cerebral palsy could be given an education. We did this because we knew that in 9 out of 10 public schools today a mentally retarded child who is educable has no chance for an education at this time. As a result of our action, last year, for the first time, they had that chance. They requested \$675,000 for this one program in mental retardation. To annualize the program they have already started, we allowed them more money this year; and the cut offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is going to affect those grants that have been made to educational institutions for research on how to train teachers and how to educate those mentally retarded children who are educable. That is one of the effects that this amendment has. It also has this effect: It has the effect that when you do not allow two-hundred-and-some-odd-thousand dollars for the annualization of these programs that are already going on it means you are going to force the Office of Education to discharge about 40 people who are now working in that Department.

So, instead of building it up, you are tearing it down because little by little these piecemeal amendments asking them to discharge 40 people on the programs that are already going on are

going to eventually destroy the programs completely. Why are we so concerned about this form of mental retardation? May I take 2 minutes to tell you how I happened to get interested in it? I believe some of you remember when I told you once before. I was asked to address a group of parents of these mentally retarded children in Rhode Island a couple of years ago. I told them of the great work that the Federal Government was doing in medical research and the advances being made in medical research. At the conclusion of the meeting, I stood around for a question period. The mothers and fathers of these unfortunate children started asking me what the Federal Government was doing in the field of research in mental retardation and cerebral palsy. I had to admit I did not know, but I told them that I would find out when I came back to Washington. In the committee the following year, we asked that question. I asked the question of Mrs. Hobby, who was then the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I asked Dr. Scheele, of the Public Health Service, and the other people who run our public-health institutes, and the answer was, "We are not doing anything in this field." As a result, we, on the committee, did something. We appropriated \$750,000. But, let me tell you another story. Coming down on the train that January, I threw the magazine, *Columbia*, into my bag. On my way down in picking it up to read, the place I happened to turn to was an article on mental retardation and cerebral palsy. It told of the dedication of a school for these children in nearby Massachusetts. The article quoted one of the great humanitarians of our country, Archbishop Richard Cushing, of Boston. I remember his words as if it were yesterday. He said in his dedication speech:

I do not like to refer to these children as mentally retarded children. I like to refer to them as exceptional children because in my mind they are closer to God than the well child because they have not had the opportunity.

He said:

I think so much of the plight of these children who are mentally retarded or have cerebral palsy that my last wish on this earth is going to be that when I die I want to be buried here at this school in the State of Massachusetts among these mentally retarded children who are so close to God.

When a man of the stature and character of Archbishop Cushing thinks as much of a problem as that, I think it indicates its importance. I do not think you want to cut back on a program now that has been going for only 1 year and is now entering its second year of operation. I do not think you want to cut any grant to these schools which are trying to alleviate such human suffering and are attempting to find solutions to such a problem. If you adopt this amendment, that is exactly what you are going to do.

As far as I am concerned, this is one of the most important and one of the most worthy areas in which the Federal Government has ever taken action. As a result of our efforts in the last Con-

gress, we extended to the parents of these exceptional children for the first time, a ray of hope that, at long last, some form of help could be expected. Adoption of the pending amendment would mean that we were reneging on our offer of assistance and that the economy bloc here in the Congress was more interested in the dollar sign than in the plight of an unfortunate child. I earnestly hope that the amendment is defeated.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MORANO), Mr. FOGARTY was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman has made a fine statement and I completely agree with him. I am interested in this problem of mentally retarded children. I think the gentleman will agree with me that every American child is born with the right to be given a chance to become a good mental as well as a good physical specimen in order to aid in the building of a better America. I think the gentleman from South Carolina would not have offered the amendment if he knew that its effect would be to deprive these young Americans of a chance of becoming mentally sound children. I am opposed to the amendment. It should be voted down.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The sole question in my mind and of every Member of this House should be whose duty is it. The Federal Government, the State government, or the local government. I assure you as a teacher of 35 years' experience that that type of mentally defective children is being taken care of in all of our modern schools today, without any help from Uncle Sam.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I disagree with the gentleman and say that that is not the case at all. Nothing was done in this field until the Federal Government got into it, and the gentleman knows it as well as I do.

Mr. MASON. Oh, years ago we did it in my time.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was not very effective then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise in support of this amendment to oppose mentally retarded children. I do rise in support of the amendment for probably a different reason than has been expressed. I do not intend to be unduly critical of the chairman of this committee. I admire him greatly. He is a hard worker. He has a big heart. I enjoy working with him in the House.

We have had conferences on the very things we are now discussing. I do not mean to attack the Appropriations Committee. They have their troubles, too. But I want to attack broadside a policy that has grown up in this Government by departments that must be halted. The language in this appropriation bill, putting it mildly, is definitely misleading, whether objectively so, I am not in a position to say, but I do say it would not be like my distinguished friend from Rhode Island to be a party to it.

I want to read to you the language that forms the basis for \$7 million:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; and cooperative research, surveys, and demonstrations in education as authorized by the act of July 26, 1954 (20 U. S. C. 331-332).

There is not a human being within the sound of my voice who would not, on reading that paragraph, say it authorizes \$7 million principally for libraries. The word "libraries" appears in the third line and the word "library" is mentioned

twice in the fourth line. It is mentioned again in the sixth line, in the eighth line, and in the ninth line.

But when you come to the budget there is not a single word about libraries.

That I do not like.

We have the library appropriations in this bill up the other day. Libraries are very popular in this country, particularly rural libraries, but I cannot for the life of me see why this language should appear in this bill. The same language has been carried in the budget and in appropriation bills for 3 solid years.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. Except for the last two lines which the gentleman read has he been able to find anything in the authorizing act suggesting any of these other lines?

Mr. BARDEN. I am going to get around to that now.

I am chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. I am thoroughly fed up with these departments coming down with a little harmless bill containing some innocent looking language, and the first thing you know—boom. You have a million-dollar department.

I have here in my hand the little bill that started this particular trouble the only one they refer to, the act of July 26, 1954. I have read it until I am dizzy; and, to save my life, I cannot expand my imagination to cover what they have got in the pending bill to justify this \$7 million.

Let me go just a little further. Here is a list of these projects:

Program and financing

	1956 actual	1957 estimate	1958 estimate
Program by activities:			
1. Administration of school assistance in federally affected areas....	\$989,301	\$992,220	\$1,075,100
2. Educational services:			
(a) Planning.....		25,000	28,520
(b) Vocational education.....	499,965	595,000	649,500
(c) State and local school systems.....	696,818	1,023,700	1,264,500
(d) Higher educational institutions.....	185,928	283,600	470,000
(e) International education.....	124,252	136,490	149,270
(f) Publications.....	118,795	220,890	273,000
(g) Legislative reference.....	41,737	57,500	75,870
3. Research services:			
(a) Planning.....	14,169	68,430	156,380
(b) Research and statistical services.....	187,927	513,515	681,860
(c) Projects.....	62,273	1,020,190	2,300,000
4. Program direction and management.....	303,613	333,465	376,000
Total obligations.....	3,224,778	5,270,000	7,500,000
Financing:			
Unobligated balance no longer available.....	15,222		
Appropriations (adjusted).....	3,240,000	5,270,000	7,500,000

(Reference, p. 647, 1958 budget.)

And I was confused a minute ago when the distinguished chairman handling the bill referred to the amount of money being used for the mentally retarded, because that authorization legislation is before my committee now and the gentleman has discussed it with me quite a bit.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not what I was talking about.

Mr. BARDEN. What was the gentleman talking about?

Mr. FOGARTY. I was not talking about training teachers; I was talking about educational research in the field of mental retardation. The bill for

training teachers is before the gentleman's committee and I hope it will be enacted this year, but it is something else than what we have in the bill now being considered. It authorizes \$500,000 for the training of teachers. There is nothing in this bill that would allow any funds for the training of teachers. That is in the bill pending before the gentleman's committee now.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to say this to the gentleman, and I think I know him quite well: Why has not somebody mentioned the fact that we were passing authorization legislation for that work?

Mr. FOGARTY. What work?

Mr. BARDEN. For this \$600,000 expense the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. FOGARTY. The \$675,000?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. We had that in our report 2 years ago and we appropriated the first amount last year. In this bill now before us there is over a million dollars for that same purpose, to carry on what we started in this program, which is authorized by law, in connection with research on these particular problems in the field of education.

Mr. BARDEN. We might just as well be frank about this.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is what I want to be.

Mr. BARDEN. That Department knows the Committee on Education and Labor has not had these matters before it. The Department knows as well as I know I am standing here that it would take a terrifically large amount of explanation and justification for me to put them into the business of, and I quote from this bill, "purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. That has nothing to do with what I was talking about. I would have no objection personally if we disallowed everything except "for necessary expenses of the Office of Education as authorized by law."

And leaving the rest out.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the committee chairman it ought to be knocked out.

Mr. FOGARTY. It does not mean hardly anything. They are so little that is not authorized by basic law that it is insignificant.

Mr. BARDEN. What I am saying is that the whole paragraph does not serve any purpose except to mislead this House. That is all it does.

Mr. FOGARTY. It has been in there for years, although it means almost nothing from a dollars and cents point of view.

Mr. BARDEN. The whole picture has been changing every year. In 1956 the appropriation was \$3,240,000, in 1957 \$5,270,000, and in 1958 \$7,500,000, and you have been using the same language for at least 3 years.

Mr. FOGARTY. No. We had it changed last year. The cooperative research program was enacted by the gentleman's committee and that gave them additional responsibilities, calling on us to appropriate two or three million dollars.

Mr. BARDEN. The only authorization I can find under that at all is the one the gentleman referred to. Heaven knows, I never thought I was opening up any such Pandora's box.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BARDEN), he was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to go along a little further. The Department—and this is not the only department that we legislate for or that the committee does—does not care about the legislative committee knowing about their business. That is the truth of the matter. They do not want us to know.

Here is a report, the 1955 report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I want to give you a little history of how much they rush down here to give us information. This report is for the fiscal year 1955. It was sent to the President on December 1, 1955, it was sent to the Speaker on December 13, 1956, and sent to my committee in 1957. I certainly could not say that a 1955 report would do me or my committee much good when the expenditures have gone off on an entirely different tangent.

Now, I want to go a little further into this appropriation. They have some projects in here. Here is one item, just borrowing one. By unanimous consent a bill went through this House, and the only reason in the world it went through the House was because the President had already appointed his committee and we felt we did not want to embarrass the President by stopping the committee after it had been appointed by the President and given the green light. That is a little bit further on in the bill, the next item, I think.

So, I reluctantly brought it to the floor of the House, and I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] raised some questions about it. I told him very frankly, "I do not care if the bill does not pass. I am not interested in the bill passing." Then he suggested cutting it down some. I said, "Sure, I will send up an amendment to cut it down." That little unanimous-consent bill now shows up with an ultimate request, I think, of \$3.2 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not believe that is the one.

Mr. BARDEN. The President's committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. On the study of education beyond high school?

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. FOGARTY. We have \$200,000 for that. They asked for \$300,000, and we gave them \$200,000 and told them to end their activities at the end of this calendar year.

Mr. BARDEN. You know they will not end up their activities this calendar year, and they have already told you how much they expect to get for next year.

Mr. FOGARTY. We have a limitation in the bill regarding their activities.

Mr. BARDEN. They will not wind up their activities, and I think what they have spent and what the budget says they will ask for amounts to \$3½ million.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that is a different bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, let us go a little further, and I will clear that up.

Mr. FOGARTY. On page 20 of the bill it explains it pretty thoroughly.

Mr. BARDEN. No. This bill does not explain anything to me.

Mr. FOGARTY. Will the gentleman permit me to just read two sentences?

Mr. BARDEN. What is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. FOGARTY. On page 20 of the bill, regarding the item we are talking about now. We allow \$200,000 and we say:

Provided, That none of these funds shall be available after December 31, 1957, except for liquidation purposes.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, now, let me see.

Mr. FOGARTY. You could not have it any plainer than that. That winds it up.

Mr. BARDEN. Is that the one under which it is justified?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is the one that they were trying to get into operation without authorization, as the gentleman will remember.

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, yes. I remember it. And, they have really gotten into it, and they are going to stay in it if they can.

Let me say this to the gentleman. I am partly responsible for this situation the House is in. I have heard a lot of talk here about "this is no way to cut a bill." I would just turn that around and say "This is no way to bring appropriations before this House," because I say in all sincerity that the bill is definitely misleading. The items in this bill should be thoroughly gone into before a legislative committee. And they know they are expanding both the language and intent of not only the legislative committee but Congress.

Let me go a little further now. When I say I am a little responsible, I should have gotten all bothered about this thing some time ago and done some investigating. I am now preparing some rather searching questions that I am either going to have the Department present the answers to me, or they will come before that committee and we will have a thorough going over with these programs and ideas.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman. I think that is your prerogative, and I think it would be a good thing. But, I say the money we have in this bill has been justified in the hearings, and the language that he refers to on page 19 of the bill, as far as I am concerned, if he would just leave in there the salaries and expenses for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, personnel, and reports authorized by law and cut out the rest, that would be perfectly all right with me. I would be agreeable to it, because as far as I am concerned it does not mean a thing.

Mr. BARDEN. Now let me see. The gentleman made some very beautiful and fine remarks and some that I heartily subscribe to about the mentally retarded. That department is not in a position to spend as much money as they are calling for, because the gentleman knows there are just a handful of experts in

this country that claim to know anything about it. They do not have the teachers, and the reason they want the bill from my committee is to train enough teachers to do some work. Now, that is the practical situation. The cutting out of this money now is not going to slow down or inconvenience or hurt a single mentally retarded child.

What they are doing is using a handful of experts to develop a program which is not now developed and they plan to utilize what few experts there are available for the teaching of teachers to do the job that you and I want done. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot agree with the gentleman. That is not the fact.

Mr. BARDEN. This money does not go to teach children.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from North Carolina is absolutely correct. Any serious study of the hearings will substantiate the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina. Many of these things in here are absolutely fallacious. Some of the words I cannot even pronounce: A sociopsychological study of acts of vandalism in schools.

This is one of the star witnesses to show what some of the money is being spent for.

An investigation of factors related to educational discontinuance of college ability high-school seniors.

The hearings state:

In fiscal 1957 services are being extended in the teaching of foreign languages, education of exceptional children—

That does not sound like mentally retarded children—

adult education, and education of the aging, guidance and student personnel, school financing, educational records and reports.

And so on.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what I am talking about. When the gentleman was talking about this money, I requested the Clerk to show me where it came from, and I have it here. It happens to be under subsection (c) listed as "Projects," for which the amount in the bill is \$2,300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to cut a single useful, valuable, helpful, justifiable project in that department too much. But the Office of the Commissioner of Education is getting too ambitious. It is having too much to do with the schools. It is spreading too much. I think it is doing things that you and I do not know anything about.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to promise this House that if I am a party to cutting out any helpful, needed, necessary, and wise program, you will see my committee coming in here with an authorization that will take care of it. But we do not like this kind of appropriation of tax money.

Mr. FOGARTY. This is what the gentleman's committee authorized 2 years ago under the cooperative research program.

Mr. BARDEN. I am so hurt, so embarrassed over that—to be frank about it, I am just ashamed of it, and this little one-half-page bill which I hold in my hand is the little trick that did it—right here. I did not know any more than a monkey how they would interpret the language and expand the language, but I think I will from here on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this debate has become very interesting. I wonder if the gentleman, my good friend from North Carolina, will be just as intensely interested when we get to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. This is very similar to the amendment that we defeated yesterday to cut by 12 percent the amount for maintenance and operation of schools in federally-impacted areas. When that bill was passed in 1950 or 1951 many people did not realize how it was going to grow. But it has been revised and extended on 2 or 3 occasions by unanimous votes of both Houses of Congress. It has grown because of authorizations that were voted on in this House. If there are any changes or any disagreements as to what should be authorized for these programs, the proper legislative committee should hold hearings and submit those recommended changes to the House, and we ought to have a chance to vote on them.

Mr. GAVIN. I am pleased to note the Members of the House are carefully considering every particular item and examining and screening everything so very carefully. I hope that you will continue to do so on all appropriation bills. I recall what my friend Bob Rich used to say, "Where are you going to get the money?" At long last this House is economy-minded and considering carefully these items in the budget. It pleases me and I am greatly encouraged.

But what I want to talk about is the agricultural appropriation bill. I just took a few minutes to go over to the Appropriations Committee. Shortly you are going to be presented with the agricultural appropriation bill. I am concerned as to whether you are going to be just as careful in your minute screening of the agricultural appropriation bill as you are in this health, education, and welfare appropriation program.

When the agricultural bill is before the House you will have an opportunity to do some careful examining and cutting, because the total agricultural estimates for 1958 are \$4,953,121,617. A lot of money. The regular activities for agriculture are \$2,136,256,708; loan authorizations, \$474,500,000; corporations,

\$1,239,788,671; special activities, \$843,401,238—a total of \$4,693,946,617. Then the permanent authorizations are \$259,175,000. This makes a total of \$4,953,121,617. So you are going to get a chance now to screen these appropriations and I trust that the Members will give their careful attention to screening and examining all parts of this program.

Let me point out Kansas is wheat, Iowa is corn, Wisconsin and Minnesota, butter, eggs and cheese; Nebraska, wool; California citrus fruits and wool; Texas, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, cotton; Georgia, soybeans, peanuts, and cotton; South Carolina and North Carolina and Virginia, tobacco. A perfect agricultural coalition. It will be interesting to see how vociferous the Members will become to cut agricultural appropriations.

You know, my Republican friends, up to 15 years ago, did not pay much attention to various agricultural programs; however, along came the various subsidy programs and then to get their nose in the trough along with the Democrats, and the coalition between the two parties has been merely carrying on these agricultural programs for years. It is a perfect setup; however, you will have a great opportunity to see where you can cut down on this agricultural appropriation bill when it comes before the House. My guess is it will not be cut very much.

I have been here day after day and listened to the debates, listened to the corn debate several weeks ago; very interesting. One side said it would cost \$250 million. Nobody here was greatly excited about it. The other side said it would cost \$900 million. It was just an argument among themselves. They evidently fell out, some misunderstanding between both sides, rather unusual, as generally they are in full agreement. Therefore, they did not get together before they brought the corn legislation to the House. But if they had gotten together, there is no question but that the bill would have passed to give relief to the corn farmer even though it would have cost from two hundred and fifty to nine hundred million dollars. I do not know which figure would have been correct; anyway it would have cost plenty. There was great confusion and misunderstanding. Both sides agreed on the principle of the proposal, except that one side felt it would appear that the other side was getting a little bit more advantage and should have included other items and not an exclusive corn program. The debate was fast and furious. The consumer, the American taxpayer, who pays the bill, was not even thought about.

No thought about economy such has been exhibited in the health and welfare program. It would appear to me that since the Members could not agree on the corn program, maybe it will help the economy of the average American who pays the bill.

The corn legislation I concluded was bypassed because the Members thought that one segment of agriculture was going to get a more advantageous position over other segments. They therefore

would not concede to each other and nothing was done about corn. I think the farmers will get along just the same. My friends, when this agricultural appropriations bill comes along making appropriations for agriculture, I hope you are going down the line item by item and screen carefully every particular item, because I think the American people are rebelling and are fed up on taxes and want some relief and want the budget cut. They want tax relief. They have been patient and have been carrying this load for many years. Let me also remind the House when the bill making appropriations for foreign aid is brought out, I hope that it, too, will be screened as carefully as the health and welfare. I do not see any of the foreign aid thinking group on the floor today. It would appear they are not too interested in this particular bill for health and welfare; maybe they are, I do not know, but there are not many around. But they will be out in strength when this \$4,400,000,000 foreign-aid bill comes out.

I trust that every item in that bill is screened as carefully as this health and welfare bill. We took all last week and we are taking this week on this bill. Last year I do not think it took but a couple of hours to pass the foreign-aid bill of several billions of dollars. Nobody got too wrought up about it. The American taxpayers objected but those of us who did voice our objections appeared as though we were out of step. However, now the American taxpayers are being heard from, entering their protests, and you have been hearing from them, so everybody is getting economy minded, cutting indiscriminately whether justified or not. I wonder, when we come to this agricultural program which you have enjoyed and supped at generously for many years, and I refer to both sides—I hold no briefs for either side or section whether it is tobacco, wool, wheat, corn, cotton, butter, eggs, cheese, or whatever it is in the way of subsidies programs—we will see what action will be taken. Now, my friends, we did not build America on the kind of agricultural program we have been having. We built America under a system of free enterprise where anybody with the ambition, the energy, resourcefulness, and the thrift could go out and be successful. But for political expediency these programs for agriculture that have been developed may wreck the economy of the country including the farmer. I wonder how many items in this agricultural bill which will appropriate, it is estimated, some \$4,953,121,617, are going to be screened as you are screening every little item here in the health and welfare program. It is interesting to hear the agricultural debate, the bleeding for the little farmer and agriculture. In fact, some have bled so much that they do not have any blood left. Many of them are becoming anemic and we may have to give them a transfusion one of these days. So the point I am trying to make is this: When you come to foreign aid, the American people are demanding that something be done about it. When you come to these subsidy programs in agriculture and you get the

chance to screen all items very carefully and minutely as you are now doing, I am going to be watching, listening, and checking to see who is going to be just as much interested in making these cuts in the agricultural appropriation and foreign aid as you are in making cuts in this program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. So there is plenty of work ahead. I am merely calling in a kindly manner, to the attention of the House the need for economy, the need for a balanced budget, the need for reducing the taxes. But do not indiscriminately pick out one particular appropriation bill and go after it in minute detail and indiscriminately cut it down to make an impression with the folks back home. In the agriculture appropriations bill there will be one particular appropriation alone for the soil-bank program and estimated to cost \$1,254,000,000. You know that that program for farm relief is a very worthy item. Whether it will do what it is intended to, we will have to wait and see. I do not know and I do not believe anybody else does.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, but I feel that this bill must be disposed of so I must make a point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment which is before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is before us is one of many amendments that have been offered and which is being very carefully considered. The only point I want to make to my very distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York whom I greatly admire, a conscientious hard-working American, who has devoted himself to his duties as a Representative on behalf of the American people, deserves our hearty commendations—is that we should consider all of these appropriation bills very carefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe that if the membership of this House had taken the time to read page by page the hearings, and then applied that to the bill as it came before the House, and they understood how they are ballooning this organization of Health, Education, and Welfare, and how the facts are secluded and beclouded, that a motion to return the bill to the committee would have the approval of this House.

There is waste in this bill from one end of it to the other. Anyone who will read it must come to the same conclusion. I notice in one place: "Adequacy

of funds for medical research." And I am reading from the hearings. Mr. FOGARTY said:

Mr. FOGARTY. I notice in the press there has been some discussion regarding your 1958 budget as to whether or not you are maintaining the level that Congress would like to see maintained as far as medical research is concerned.

Secretary FOLSOM. Well, the question—

Mr. FOGARTY. I noticed that some people think that this looks like the 1954 budget.

Secretary FOLSOM. I think there is a misunderstanding there. As you know, Congress gave us \$56 million more last year than we asked for, \$184 million altogether, and we declared in a statement that we would maintain the same high standards we maintained before.

Mr. FOGARTY. I want to congratulate you on that.

Then Mr. Folsom says:

As indicated in my statement, the estimated expenditures were \$172½ million—and this is where some of the people in the Senate have misunderstood our action. At that time the NIH gave me an estimate—

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the gentleman is discussing a portion of the bill that we have not yet reached. He is not discussing the amendment before us.

Mr. VURSELL. I can understand why the gentleman does not want to hear it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. VURSELL. Now we come to medical expense.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the gentleman is not proceeding in order. The gentleman should confine his remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. VURSELL. I am trying to draw a parallel to show that this amendment beclouds the issue and it would seem to me that the testimony before the committee should be given to the House before they vote on this amendment.

I find further in reading, and if I am not in order the Chair may call me to order. At another place, discussing this legislation the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] said:

I am all for that too, but I do not think your proposal will come anywhere near fulfilling the need. It is just a drop in the bucket to what is needed.

Then in another place—

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the gentleman is not proceeding in order and is not discussing this amendment. If we are ever to finish this bill we must speak to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must proceed in order or take his seat.

Mr. VURSELL. I think if one had listened attentively to what I believe to be the greatest speech that has been made on this floor since this bill has been brought before the House, made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], they would certainly feel that the reduction he is asking for in this particular amendment should have the approval of this House. It is amazing to me that in a bill of this magnitude and expense, when there is a real opportunity to make a reduction in the cost of

government with reference to this bill, that this House does not support this amendment and make this reduction. Now is the time for you who have been talking economy to show you mean it by voting for this amendment. It ought to make other reductions which are justified, and it would seem to me that this is justified. If you need further evidence I refer you to the speech made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], certainly a man dedicated to the support and advancement of education throughout this land. Certainly with that information before you it is time to vote. I regret that I have imposed thus long upon you and I hope you will vote to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. DORN of South Carolina) there were—ayes 94, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School: For salaries and expenses for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings, \$200,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available after December 31, 1957, except for liquidation purposes.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHUFORD: Page 19, line 23, strike out the paragraph down to and including line 6 on page 20.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out from line 23 on page 19 to and including line 6 on page 20. I would like to read the section which would be deleted by this amendment:

President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School: For salaries and expenses for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings, \$200,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available after December 31, 1957, except for liquidation purposes.

It is provided, Mr. Chairman, that none of these funds shall be available after December 31, 1957, except for liquidation purposes.

I would like to call the Committee's attention to the fact that as stated by my colleague from North Carolina, this authorizing legislation came to the House and was passed by consent by reason of the fact that the Committee had already been appointed by the President.

Here are some of the objects and purposes of the legislation for which this appropriation is asked: To encourage and assist each State to provide for a State committee on education beyond the high school, composed of educators and other

interested citizens; to consider educational problems beyond the high school and to make recommendations for appropriate action to be taken by public and private agencies at local, State, regional, and Federal levels.

Those are some of the duties imposed upon this Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

To start with and to get its work going, there was appropriated last year the sum of \$150,000.

To complete the work and liquidate, they have provided \$200,000 just to wind it up, and this my amendment would take out.

There is something peculiar about this bill. That is, there is provision for a supplemental bill or appropriation to come in for \$650,000 which will be submitted to the House at some later date this year. Next year they propose for the use of this educational committee the sum of \$2,500,000.

This is a good example of how a program gets a foothold with the Congress, and then suddenly mushrooms into something never intended by the Congress.

The purpose of my amendment is to stop the program immediately and to discontinue it entirely. According to the testimony which I have recently read, the educational committee is to make a report to the President by January 1, next year. By questions of the chairman of the subcommittee, we learn that it will take the educational committee 6 months more to write up its findings. The additional sum appropriated in this act is for the purpose of acquiring 20 additional employees to help write the final report. Some of them will get a salary up to \$10,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary, I do not think we want to carry on this kind of a program. I hope that my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD].

Mr. Chairman, the history of this appropriation is that a year ago the Office of Education appeared before the Appropriations Committee asking for \$1,100,000 for this program. We questioned the authority for the program at that time and they told us they did not have authority. So the Committee on Appropriations denied them the request for \$1,100,000, and chastised them in the report that we filed last year for starting this program without going through the regular legislative channels.

They went to the Committee on Education and Labor. They got that committee to favorably report a bill giving them authorization. The Committee on Education and Labor came out on the floor of the House with that bill and it was unanimously passed by the House last year. That was to set up this President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

This year they requested \$300,000 to complete their work. The committee cut that \$100,000, allowing them \$200,000, and wrote a provision in the bill that is before us now that will wind up their

affairs by December 31 of the present calendar year.

This is a project of your President, it is the President's Committee on Higher Education. Now let us see how many Republicans will stand up and support the President of the United States.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to give you the history of this project. This was started originally April 19, 1956, when the President allocated \$50,000 from his emergency fund. Shortly thereafter the administration requested statutory authority for \$800,000 to be used as grants to the States to study the problem in this area.

During the course of the hearings the subcommittee was informed that the original request would have to be amended so as to provide an authorization for funds for the President's committee in as much as the Committee on Appropriations had refused to allow the emergency fund of the President to be used for the purpose during fiscal 1956-57. The President had already appointed his committee. The committee was set up. On this basis the Committee on Education and Labor reported the bill H. R. 12237, including authority for \$800,000 for State grants and open-ended it as to the President's committee. The \$650,000 figure was substituted for the \$800,000 on the floor of the House to meet the demands of the official objectors. It was brought out that the Department had asked for \$300,000 for the President's committee; nothing for the State grants. That was Public Law 813 of the 83d Congress, and it was a unanimous-consent bill brought to the floor of this House; \$150,000 was appropriated for the President's committee for fiscal 1956-57. Nothing was appropriated for the State grants because no request was forthcoming.

Now here is the current situation. The appropriation bill now being considered contains an item of \$200,000 for the President's committee on education beyond the high-school level. There is nothing in the bill for the State activity, which is why the enabling legislation was enacted in the first instance.

Now here is the part that begins to give you a little warning. The budget also notes that \$650,000 will be asked for later for the State programs. See page 700. In this connection it should be noted that the final report of the President's committee is due on December 31, 1957. The budget also notes that a new program—pay attention for this is getting serious now—to cost \$2.5 million will also be sent to Congress later to assist the States. That, I believe, is on page 701. Is that not right? Now, just note how a little unanimous-consent bill will grow.

Now, should the Congress approve the present request and the future proposals in this area, the total cost would be about \$3,350,000. I think the gentleman from Rhode Island will agree that is an accurate statement. Now here they are going to recommend—and it will go if this amendment fails; that is the tip-off for the program—they are going to rec-

commend \$2.5 million for States to study the problem in that area between high school and college. Mr. Chairman, this \$200,000 is not going to do a thing in the world that will do this country any good, and when they finish filing their report on December 31 they will not know any more about it than they do now, after having spent \$2,500,000. I sincerely hope the amendment offered by the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 85, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assistance to State, general: To carry out the purposes not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of the act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant to section 311 of the act; to make field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the act; to provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics; to provide traineeships pursuant to section 306 of the act; and not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General; \$19,592,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 22, line 21, strike out "\$19,592,000" and insert "\$17,744,600."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will cut from this item \$1,847,000. It will leave the amount what it is in the current year plus \$153,600, which will approximately take care of the mandatory Civil Service increases. If it does not exactly take care of that, what little may remain can very well be absorbed.

This is not an item concerning which it can be said that we are cutting off any of the very necessary functions under the principal money item in this program.

The agency asked for an increase of \$3 million in the grants to the States for general health. We are all acquainted with what that means. The committee did not grant that \$3 million increase which was asked but left that item where it is in the current year, at \$12 million; so that no one can come before the committee today and say that we are wrecking the principal part of this program. What it will do is cut back the amounts increased in this item on eight other activities in this program to the level where they were for the 1957 fiscal year.

This does not affect the program for cancer, for research in heart trouble or tuberculosis or arthritis, or for any of those things. You can take your bill here and look over on pages 28, 29, and 30 and you will see that that is where these items are carried. You can look on page 429 of the hearings and observe there the pattern under which all of these programs and activities expand

year by year. If you turn to page 429 you will see that in the 1956 fiscal year they had seven activities. In the 1957 fiscal year they asked for an increase in every one of the existing activities except one, and they asked for another activity. In this 1958 fiscal year they are following the pattern; they ask for an increase in eight activities plus another new activity. So the pattern is, and it is followed year after year, to ask for an increase in every existing activity and then add a new activity. That is the way these programs and activities expand and mushroom year after year.

The activities where the increases are granted are such things as this: For public health training. That was the new activity in the current fiscal year. They asked \$1 million and got it in this 1957 fiscal year. One of these increases in this bill is to double that activity, raise it from \$1 million to \$2 million.

Other increases are for technical assistance to the States, vital statistics, international health activities, health of the aged, chronic diseases, occupational health, accident prevention, and then an increase in administration.

We are not hurting any program by holding these things down to the figure they got in the 1957 fiscal year, and that is what I am asking you to do in this. As I said, the subcommittee did not grant any increase in the \$12 million which they had this year in grants to the States for general health. They did not need any increase there. The committee recognized it and did not give it to them. They did not give them the new activity they asked for, which was for special projects in health of the aged and chronic diseases. They did not give them that. In those two things they held them down. But they gave them increases in these others which are not needed particularly at this time when the paramount objective ought to be to give the people of this country essential governmental services but no frills.

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first attempt to cut public health. I am amazed at the gentleman from Georgia offering this amendment because if there is any State in the Union that has made great gains with Federal help and Federal technical assistance in the field of public health, it is the State of Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Is it not a fact that the State Georgia has made this remarkable progress through our own efforts?

Mr. FOGARTY. Absolutely not. Georgia has received millions of dollars of Federal funds for public health through grants-in-aid and your people in Georgia are regularly asking and demanding services of the United States Public Health Service that are financed by this particular appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The people of the State of Georgia have spent their own funds for this work.

Mr. FOGARTY. Of course, they have spent some of their own funds but they have certainly spent plenty of Federal funds, too. Just take the Federal grants for venereal-disease control as one instance. Georgia got the lion's share of that public-health appropriation last year—more than any other State, but 1 out of the entire 48. Those who have charge of your public-health work in the State of Georgia still demand this service and they want it. They are not in favor of this cut.

What is the record of the committee? The committee has already made a cut of over \$5 million in this 1 item. We cut out \$1,500,000 of grant funds for a study on chronic diseases and the aging because it was not authorized by law. We made other cuts where we made a careful study. Now the gentleman from Georgia has said that this will have no effect on the control of tuberculosis. That is not so at all because some of these grants to States for general public-health services are being used for the control of tuberculosis, cancer, mental health, heart disease, and many others. I expect that is true in your State, and if there is any State that needs control of tuberculosis, it is your State of Georgia. Now that is one area that you are cutting out.

Let me tell you other areas that you are cutting out by your amendment. We allowed a \$1-million increase for public health training. Certainly that is one of the greatest needs in the health field today. That is the training of public health personnel. Here you are getting up on the floor of the House and advocating a cut in the most-needed area of public health service in the country, that is the training of public health personnel, which all the States are asking for now.

Everyone is concerned about the health of the aging and chronic diseases. I am sure the gentleman wants to do what he can for the aged of our country and to help alleviate the suffering of aged people who have chronic diseases. The gentleman's amendment is going to cripple that program because it would cut out an increase allowed by the committee for that purpose.

Another item of increase they asked for this year was in the field of accident prevention. They asked for \$300,000 increase for accident prevention work. The gentleman's amendment cuts that out. The gentleman does not want the Public Health Service to work with the States in preventing accidents which is one of the leading causes of death in the country at the present time. These are the things that the gentleman's amendment would cut out of this bill. This appropriation that the gentleman is trying to cut is the very backbone of the Federal public health service of this country. It has been successful because of the cooperation between the public health service personnel in the States and the people on the Federal level. I think the cooperation is excellent. The \$12 million grant item goes to States like Georgia and they can use it for almost anything they want to so long as it is for public health services. We do not demand that they use it for specific diseases, because some States have more

acute problems with one disease and other States with another disease.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman has said that my amendment would cut out money in the bill for special projects on health of the aged and chronic diseases. Does the gentleman mean to tell the House that you put a nickel in the bill for that item?

Mr. FOGARTY. Under the direct operation for health of the aged and chronic diseases, they asked for \$1,200,000, an increase of \$650,000, and the committee allowed the major part of the increase but your amendment cuts out that increase.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Did you not cut out the item for special projects of help for the aged?

Mr. FOGARTY. As I said, at the beginning of my remarks, we cut that item out because it was not authorized by law and we said so in our report. As far as I am concerned, we would have allowed it if it had been authorized by law, I may say to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. You also said that I had cut out accident prevention.

Mr. FOGARTY. The increase. The increase that was asked for, and most of which is included in the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. All I have cut out is the increase.

Mr. FOGARTY. But the increase is practically the whole program. They have \$51,000 this year and asked for \$351,000 for 1958. Accidents are on the increase. If you want to let deaths occurring because of accidents keep on going up as they have been, that is the kind of thing you are inviting by adopting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), Mr. FOGARTY was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Is it not true that there is a reduction already made by our subcommittee of \$5,017,000 in this particular item?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is correct. I thought the committee had done a pretty good job in reducing this item. I was amazed when we had an amendment further cutting the Public Health Service by another \$2 million, and to make these cuts in the ways I have mentioned.

The statistics we have on accidents are that accidents are the No. 1 killer between the ages of 1 and 34. Almost a hundred thousand people were killed because of accidents in 1955. That increase in deaths by accident is the reason the Public Health Service has asked for an increase in this program. That is exactly why the committee allowed most of the increase. I cannot conceive of this Congress cutting back a program like this that will save lives in the future.

As far as chronic diseases in our aging people is concerned, there are now 28 million suffering from chronic dis-

eases. The annual cost is \$3 billion in public expenditures and a loss of three-quarters of a billion man-days production. The elimination of this increase means that the program aimed at the prevention and control of those conditions will have to be cut. I do not think you want to take this service away from the aging people in our country by passing such an amendment as the gentleman has offered. But that is exactly what you are doing in this amendment.

We have been attempting to get this administration to do something about the problem of the aging, and this is one of the steps they are suggesting in this appropriation. We were attempting to give the Public Health Service additional funds to try to find out what causes these chronic conditions in aging people and what can be done to alleviate them.

If you have a child 10 years old today and you have another child born tomorrow, that child born tomorrow is expected to live 10 years longer than the 10-year-old child today. That is how fast we have progressed in medical research in the past 10 years. I do not want to see that progress stopped, but that progress will be stopped by this kind of amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does the gentleman want us to believe that the Federal Government is responsible for that progress?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; not entirely. But it certainly has contributed. When your time comes I am ready for your amendments too. I will discuss, in connection with each of them what part the Federal Government has played in research, and how this Congress has, for 10 or 11 years to my knowledge, taken the lead in appropriating funds for medical research, and as a result we can claim some credit in the extension of life expectancy of our citizens.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that is the issue, and what we should be talking about? There has been nothing said on what this program is and what it has done.

Mr. FOGARTY. I understood from your remarks yesterday that you will offer amendments when we reach that part of the bill, and I am ready to discuss those amendments when they are offered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But I am talking about this amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. I have just given some statistics and facts to show that the Federal Government should be trying to do something in this field of accident prevention, for one thing.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What are they doing?

Mr. FOGARTY. And in the Bureau of Labor Standards, of the Department of Labor, which I presume you helped to cut the other day, they have one of the best records in the field of accident prevention that I know of. They have been especially effective in training personnel in the States. They have been a really big factor in preventing accidents in industry in the entire country.

In this part of the bill we have a companion program in the Public Health Service. We have in the Public Health Service grants to some institutions for research in this field, for instance, for neurological studies on drivers who are repeaters in accidents.

You know, of course, the interest that has been aroused in the last few months over the increase in automobile accidents. Your President and my President has taken a great deal of interest in this and I feel sure he would not want this cut. We have grants in the Public Health Service for that purpose, and we have funds for that purpose in this particular item unless this amendment passes and they are cut out. As long as this program helps in any way, even if it only reduces the deaths by 1 percent, even if it saves only that many lives, in my opinion it is worth all the millions we have spent. If you want to put a dollar sign upon the life of any person in the country you can do it but I am not going to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached what I consider the most important part of this very important bill. I confess to you I am deeply concerned. I have seen Members vote on questions that I considered vital, yet they did not seem to fully appreciate the importance of the matter they were voting upon. I have been concerned as I have frequently seen what has appeared to me to be an absolute ignoring of the basic facts in the case.

I have been in this body a good many years; I have been here long enough to have formed some very definite opinions based upon my experience. On the basis of what I have observed over a period of nearly 31 years, I want to say to you with all the sincerity of which I am capable, that I have never seen a chairman of any Appropriations Subcommittee come before this House so well prepared, so able to answer the questions that have been raised, or give more sufficient reasons and justification for the acts of his committee than the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. We have been informed that in his early days he was trained as a bricklayer. As a result of the fine work he has done as chairman of this subcommittee I say to you, let us get more bricklayers in the House.

The manner in which he has put this bill together, the basic justification for every act of his committee, indicates that he knows how to build and build well. When he speaks, as he has done so fervently without undue emotion but with deep sincerity in behalf of these matters with which he is so familiar after a period of 11 years on the committee and 7 years as its chairman, it seems to me the least this House can do is to follow his leadership in the matter of these important appropriations and particularly the subject of health, the discussion of which we are now about to enter upon. A very distinguished Member on my side of the House a few days ago rose and stated that there have been speeches that stirred our emotions, and, then he said, "I want you now to stir your minds."

Can it be that in the House of Representatives of the people of this Nation of ours there is to be no place for emotion?

I do not appeal to you to cast all other considerations aside and think only in the terms of emotion, nor do I want you to cast aside all thoughts of emotion and vote and think merely in terms of the mind. I want you to use both. If you will let the inner feelings of your hearts stir your emotions in these matters that so shortly will come before us under this title "Public Health," and then use your mind, it will be as fine a combination in support of the people of this Nation and their welfare as there could be.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, permit me to remind you our committee has legislative jurisdiction of these questions of health from the authorizing standpoint in most of the instances that will come before you in the provisions of this bill. I confess to you that in all the time I have served in this House there has never been any work or service that I have been called upon to perform that has touched me so deeply nor in which I have been more greatly interested than that of our committee in its work for the health of the people of this Nation of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I hope the gentleman will address himself to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, during the time I have been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we have studied and discussed public health from every angle. The motion at the present time is to amend the provision to carry on the program of public health by cutting the appropriation. Everything I have said and everything I expect to say or do by vote or otherwise will be in support of the appropriations the committee has reported to this House to promote, maintain, and support the Federal health program and research into the cause and cure of the crippling diseases that confront our people today.

During the time that I have been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have seen the activity of this Government in these matters of public health increase from year to year. It has been slow progress that has been made. It has not been nearly as fast as I would like to have seen it and it has not been nearly as thorough in meeting the need that has been revealed to our committee in its many hearings over a period of years.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a few years ago—I was chairman of the committee at that time—conducted a series of studies. We had before us 95 of the most outstanding leaders of every type of crippling disease that this bill refers to or that will be referred to at any time in the debate on this bill. They were not ordi-

nary men, they were the best in the Nation as heart specialists, they were the best in the Nation as cancer specialists, they were the best in this Nation in the field of neurology, they were the best in this Nation in the field of mental diseases, and the same was true of all the other diseases of a crippling character that are experienced by our people, young and old. These men were outstanding and they gave freely of their advice to us in this matter.

Here are the hearings conducted by this Appropriation Subcommittee in support of this bill. Have those who voted against its provisions read them? I will venture to say there is many a one who voted for amendments to cut appropriations who would not have done so if he had read the contents of these three books of hearings covering over 1,700 printed pages. These hearings were conducted in a most dignified way, in a most searching manner, of the most outstanding physicians, surgeons, social welfare workers, and laymen with benevolent inclinations in this land of ours. Their names are known not merely as leaders, but they are known and recognized as outstanding leaders in the several fields of health covered by this bill. It is they who have testified in behalf of the provisions in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that my time is too short to say all I would like to say.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would like to say that it is a source of great pride to hear this distinguished Member, the dean of the New Jersey delegation, make such a magnificent speech. He has always been an advocate of this cause, and on both sides of the aisle we are extremely proud of him for it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. From the Republican side from Pennsylvania I would like to compliment the gentleman and say that I would like to join with the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey and that many of us who have not spoken yet thoroughly agree with you.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain of the fact that there are on my side of the aisle individuals who, on the rollcalls on these amendments, will be willing, as somebody said here today, to stand up and be counted, and it will be against the crippling amendments that are being made to this most worthwhile bill. It will not be a case of just five of us standing up, as it happened to be on one occasion. There will be more than that, in my opinion, and if not, I will be surprised and disappointed. I wish I could speak individually to the membership on our side of the aisle, and I wish I could speak individually from a party standpoint and impress them with the fact that the reason our great President, Dwight D. Eisen-

hower, made such a marvelous run through every section of this land of ours was because of the fact that the people recognized in him a man whose heart was in tune with the people of this Nation of ours and whose welfare he sought to provide. This was the reason they voted for him.

Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration, as I have already stated, that portion of the pending appropriation bill that provides funds for the operation of the various health agencies of our Government.

During the last few days there has been manifest a bipartisan effort to cut the appropriations that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has made for the operation of certain labor functions of the Department of Labor. In my opinion not all of the cuts that have been made by motions from the floor of the House were justified. However, in each of these instances it has seemed to me that such cuts made from the floor and that were in addition to what the committee had already made were ill advised and not justified.

The committee that prepared this bill under the careful supervision and consideration of its chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and brought it to the floor of the House, has made a successful effort to cut budget requests whenever the facts presented and the studies made justified such a course. The result is a splendid job of sensible and carefully considered pruning. The result of the committee's action has been the saving of many millions of dollars to the taxpayer. However and notwithstanding the substantial cuts already made by the committee, we have seen the bipartisan group, to which I have referred, is not content with the considered judgment of the committee, and this group from outside the committee has sponsored further cuts that cannot do otherwise than handicap the work of the Department of Labor in the performance of duties previously placed upon it by the Congress.

I am certain that our people, anxious though they are for a reduction in the budget, do not expect unreasonable, unwise, and unjustified cuts to be made. I am anxious to see cuts that can be justified but not those which do not have solid reasons to support them.

In view of what seems to me to have been a tendency to make cuts, whether or no, in other provisions of the bill, I am concerned that similar attempts may likewise be made as to the appropriations for this all-important part of the bill. I cannot emphasize too strongly that such should not be the case.

The need for an overall health program and the several research programs and other activities now being carried on by our Government to prevent and find curative means for many of the diseases that have stricken down so many thousands of our people is a matter of major importance. These diseases result not only in great physical distress but in many instances distress of a kind that results in excruciating pain and suffering, involving great financial burdens upon the families of these sufferers, and, finally, only relieved by death itself.

I wish to repeat and emphasize that it has been a great privilege for me to serve these many years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House as the committee which has jurisdiction, among its many other activities, of considering and reporting to the House programs designed to promote the health of our people. And I again repeat there has been no service that I have rendered during the upward of 31 years I have served in this House, that has come so close to my heart's desire or given me greater pleasure than the work of our committee in this matter of health of which I have been privileged to have had a part.

During these years I have seen the programs grow year after year. The accomplishments have steadily increased. At times it has seemed slow in view of the great need that existed. However, we can be thankful that at least some progress has been made each year. To know the need as I do as a result of my many years of contact with this subject is to bring a large amount of happiness for any forward steps that are taken. I must confess there have also been moments of unhappiness and dismay that the progress made was so slow.

And, now I come to a point where I am greatly concerned for fear that the desire to cut, and cut, and cut in an effort to reduce the overall cost of Government, as has been manifest in the past few days, may find expression also in this most humane and intensely necessary field of Government activity, namely the health of our people and with particular reference to the research programs that have been set up to study and find ways and means of preventing and curing those many diseases that in some instances are considered to be the greatest killers of mankind and in all instances the most crippling.

During the time that I served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce my interest became so great that when I became chairman of the committee a few years back I requested the committee to inaugurate a study of the whole subject of health.

I now wish to set forth in as brief a manner as I can the extent and purpose of the committee in making this study of the health needs of the Nation and the resultant legislation that was proposed.

In the first place, I want to emphasize the underlying factor that impelled us to make the study, namely, a recognition of the fact that a long-term illness today represents a financial catastrophe to the average family. Heart disease, cancer, tuberculosis, arthritis, rheumatism, polio, blindness, diabetes, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and like diseases represent a crippling burden even where the best in medical care is available.

With this problem, one of the most serious and important facing our people today, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was, and continues to be, properly concerned. We set for ourselves the task of trying to see what might be done about it. Thus, we initiated a series of hearings to study what can and should be done to provide addi-

tional protection for our people against the recognized crippling diseases and the heavy burden—and all too frequent financial catastrophe—that arises from the major long-term illnesses.

The hearings sought to ascertain what is known today about the causes, control, and treatment of the principal diseases. We were concerned specifically with finding out just what has been accomplished, how it has been accomplished, what the problems are, what the future holds, and what additional steps might be taken by way of research or other measures to hasten relief from these dreadful diseases, mitigate human suffering, and curtail the losses which disease inflicts upon our national economy.

During the hearings the committee received extensive testimony on the present state of research into causes and control of some of these principal scourges of mankind. The committee had the unstinted and cordial cooperation of some 95 outstanding and distinguished physicians, scientists, and laymen who had devoted their lives to research in the fields of these major diseases. They advised us on the current status of knowledge in their respective fields of endeavor as to what the causes might be and as to what were the means of preventing or curing these diseases, in mitigating their effects, and what further might be done to bring successful culmination by means of research. Through these witnesses we also learned in great detail the extent of public and private efforts to find the causes of and possible methods to control diseases of a crippling character. Their testimony presented a dismal catalog of the magnitude of the disease problem.

Disease by disease, the witnesses enumerated the number of people afflicted, the number of premature deaths, the number of people crippled, the cost of illness to the individual and his family, and the cost of the disease to the Nation in terms of lost production, lost manpower, and the tax burden for medical care.

We were told that heart disease is the leading cause of death in the United States, causing more than 1 out of every 2 deaths each year. It is the leading cause of death among children, and exacts a toll from every age group.

At the rate at which we are acquiring cancer, 50 million of the present population of the United States will acquire cancer, and about 25 million of them will die from that disease.

The number of mentally ill patients in the United States exceeds the number of patients suffering from any other type of disease—approximately half or 662,500 out of 1,425,000 hospital beds in the United States were needed and used at that time for this group of illnesses.

Cerebral vascular disease, while causing some 160,000 deaths yearly, is more serious as a permanentcrippler, leaving 1,800,000 now alive and crippled, paralyzing the body, or seriously limiting the powers of movement, speech, and vision. The other neurological and sensory disorders, similarly affecting the brain or spinal cord, are responsible for the disablement of another 8,200,000 persons.

There are 300,000 men, women, and children in the United States who are totally blind, and 300,000 more have visual defects so serious as to create partial or almost total disability.

Arthritis, with a total of 10 million victims as of that day and with over 1 million permanently disabled, afflicts more people, cripples and disables more people, and brings more pain to more people than any other chronic disease.

There were at least 1 million known diabetics in the country at that time.

At that time more than 250,000 Americans of working age alone were unable to work because of active tuberculosis.

During the years 1938–52, 302,677 cases of poliomyelitis were reported in the United States and its Territories. During the same years 20,916 deaths were caused by this disease. The estimate for 1953 was 35,000 cases. We may thank God that as a result of research a remedy has been found that will greatly reduce this annual toll.

However, the testimony of these witnesses was not all gloom.

They also outlined for us the tremendous progress which has been made in reducing the illness and death rate from certain diseases, particularly those of infectious nature. Infectious diseases have diminished as a national problem, for with the identification of the causes of these diseases it has been possible to develop means of prevention, control, and, when the diseases occur, their prompt and curative treatment. All of this has been greatly aided by the research programs that have been carried on.

In the case of noninfectious diseases, improvement has not been so marked. There has been an actual increase in the incidence of and death rate from these diseases, especially those classed as chronic. One of the principal difficulties is lack of knowledge, knowledge about the causes of these principal diseases from which mankind suffers today. Without such knowledge, the prevention, control, or cure of any disease is impossible.

From the testimony these distinguished witnesses gave before our committee it did not seem that adequate treatment was available for such afflictions as heart disease, cancer, arthritis, and rheumatic disorders, cerebral palsy, and muscular dystrophy. For example, the physician knows that after an attack of coronary thrombosis or a cerebral hemorrhage he can aid the patient by treating symptoms, but he cannot prevent or cure the disorder. If he does not fully understand the underlying causes of these ailments he is not able to eliminate them. Similarly, he may completely remove a malignant growth by surgery or slow its growth by X-ray treatment. But if these treatments are not completely successful, as is too frequently the case, the physician is unable to do much more than to provide palliative treatment. He does not know the causes of tumor growth and he is thus unable truly to conquer it.

While it is obvious that in some of these fields we do not yet know how we may provide a complete cure, nor in

others do we know just what we are fighting, research activities already have produced marvelous results in the prevention and treatment of some of them. And we may be well along the road to a solution in some of them.

However, it is all too evident that at the present time these diseases continue to be, and probably will continue to be for some time, a tremendous burden upon the families of our Nation as they attempt to meet the costs of providing the medical care which long-continued illness places upon them. Indeed, the very fact that we are now able in some degree to treat many of these diseases and prolong human lives but increases the problems of an economic nature. Extended hospitalization and medical attention prove exceedingly costly, and such costs are mounting.

What families today—with one of their number suddenly stricken—can afford from their own resources to pay \$4,380—the amount given to us as the possible cost involved in the hospitalization of a chronic heart patient for 1 year; or the monthly cost at a cerebral palsy center offering the full range of medical, psychological, and social services, averaging as much as \$750 per child; or the heavy cost per year in keeping a seriously involved polio case in an iron lung?

Or, if from their own resources, and those of relatives, they can meet the costs of such illness, at what cost to them in financial readjustment, lowered standard of living, interrupted schooling, uprooted children, loss of lay away for old age, or assumption of the breadwinner's role by someone else?

Does not all this encourage and inspire us to greater efforts in the field of research? Does it not impel us to greater activity? Does it not cause the red blood in our veins to course stronger and more irresistibly to provide every possible means to find ways and means of dealing with these crippling conditions? The answer is "Yes." The way to do it is support the appropriations now before us; all of them; and as fully as recommended by this illustrious committee. The work that has been done by JOHN FOGARTY and his committee deserves our full-hearted support.

Let us start to show our appreciation of their work by defeating this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia which is the opening wedge for others to follow. The purpose of all of which is to cut down, curtail and hamper the work of the Federal Government in the great field of promoting the health of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that when we take more than 10 minutes at this stage of the proceedings in the consideration of this bill by one Member,

that it is asking just a little bit too much, and I must object.

(Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and also the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the defense of this public-health appropriation. Following debate on this bill for the past few days, it makes me wonder if we are not losing all sense of values. I cannot think of anything more important to our country than the health, education, and welfare of our people. To cripple programs like this, programs which are so essential to the national welfare, in my opinion, is the worst kind of false economy.

I have had the opportunity in recent weeks to meet with the deans and directors of the schools of public-health groups of our country. They are people who are doing a tremendous public service. They are devoted servants to the cause of public health. Every one of them could get a much better income or salary in private practice. They are concerned over the lack of adequate training facilities in the public-health field. We ought to be talking about improving the service. The challenge to us certainly calls for nothing less than the money asked for in this bill for public-health service. I consider the public-health training program an essential part of the fight against crippling diseases.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to ask if it is not the gentleman's opinion that instead of condemning these agencies for adding new functions and new activities that we should say, in view of the fact that people are dying and suffering, that they are not advancing them with a rapidity that would be good for the country.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman, my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania is exactly right. We have heard a lot of talk today about the big, bad Federal bureaucracy. It is not time we start watching the financial bureaucracy and the oil bureaucracy. Only last week financial interests were very effective in killing the Patman resolution calling for a probe of fiscal and credit policies. For the last few days selfish interests have been pressing the fight to cripple these essential welfare programs.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman, my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to join the gentlemen in recommending the approval of these appropriations for our health and welfare services. I should

like to point out that under these amendments there would be \$12 million cut from Pennsylvania for people who need advice on employment, people who are over 40, who cannot get jobs. Certainly we should continue to maintain services of that kind. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. We in Pennsylvania are very much concerned and we want these services to continue. I think it is about time that we think of human values.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 62, noes 79.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 77, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 371 of the act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings, \$2,165,000.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this to serve notice on the House that there will be no more extensions of time today.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$50 million, to remain available only until June 30, 1959.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER: On page 25, strike out lines 1 through 4.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how we will fare on this amendment. From the standpoint of the amount of money involved, it, of course, is the most important one that has been offered because it will strike out \$50 million, a very substantial amount. I know I have been approached by telephone and otherwise several times today asking me not to offer it. I know if it is adopted, the district I represent will receive considerably less money in Federal grants in the next year than would otherwise be the case. I know the same is probably true of every Member here. So I am quite aware of the situation. I think it is important that we understand

the issue and that each of us vote as we see fit. As I say, this amendment would save \$50 million in 1 year. It is a saving that can be achieved without having an adverse effect on public welfare or on our national defense. Therefore, it meets the President's criteria in respect to reducing the budget and it responds to the public's demand that we here now take bold steps toward reducing Federal spending. If this amendment is adopted, it means that Federal grants to towns and cities over the Nation to pay for their sewer systems will not be made next year except out of the committed funds or the obligated funds included in the current appropriation. That means less, as I say, in Federal grants to each congressional district. Let me talk for just a moment because I think it is most important that we understand the issue and the background of it. Section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act authorizes outright grants to cities and towns in accordance with a Federal formula.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. MORANO. What is the maximum population that a city or town must have in order to be eligible to get a grant?

Mr. FISHER. There is no limitation. There is a formula which provides that at least 50 percent of the \$50 million annually must go to those of 125,000 or under. There are other provisions which I will go into, but I am afraid the 5-minute rule is going to stop me before I get started. I was going to ask for another 5 minutes to try to explain this more thoroughly.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. Anyway, section 6 which we adopted 2 years ago, and which some voted for and some voted against, and I was one who voted against it—but it was enacted. I think Members were generally under the impression at that time that section 6 was associated rather directly and closely with the prevention of stream pollution. Many thought it was a stream-pollution bill. But, in actual practice, as can be determined if a study of the grants were made, and I am familiar with a limited number of them, that those that have been eligible, at least some of them, are located away from running streams. Two towns in my district qualified and have been given grants and I am sure there are at least 20 and possibly 30 others in my district that can qualify. Some are on streams and some are not. So being located on a stream is not necessarily an essential in order to qualify for a grant. So in actual practice, this is a Federal grant to localities to help them pay for one phase of maintaining local utilities and services. It could just as logically in practice be used to help pay for street improvements, for city park improvements or for school construction or any other utility or any other service that an organized municipality functions for. In other words, every town has a sewerage system—they either have one or are planning one. It is just as essential a

function as building streets or providing courts and so on.

Probably 10 or 15 percent of the bonds sold are used to pay for sewage systems. Of course, if Uncle Sam comes in and makes a donation to help on these services, they will be able to devote more money to streets and schools and so forth. It is one of many essential parts of the public service that is provided by various municipalities.

Mr. Chairman, it is only proper that any municipality which can qualify apply for aid under section 6. The Congress appropriated \$50 million to be spent this year. Every city and town must pay its pro rata part of the taxes to provide that money—whether they get any of it back or not. It is being spent some place, and it is certainly proper that any eligible city make application if it so desires.

But my amendment deals with the broad principle involved in having the Federal Government hand out grants, not loans, all over the country to help people pay for one of their local services. And I am talking about a Federal Government that is in debt to the tune of \$278 billion. And I am talking about a Federal Government that is faced with a \$71.2 billion budget this coming fiscal year—the highest in the peacetime history of this country.

Is it any wonder that people all over this country have become gravely concerned about the magnitude of Federal spending? Is it any wonder that they are calling on the Congress to reduce, reduce, reduce? Is it any wonder that in my own State of Texas the State legislature recently memorialized the Congress to take drastic steps in reducing the spending?

Now the only way to reduce is to reduce. Do we really and honestly mean to do something about it, or do we just want to talk about it?

Actually, practically any town or city in the country can qualify for this type of Federal grant. It does not necessarily deal with emergency or unusual problems. It has general application, under the formula with respect to amounts that will be given.

This program penalizes communities which take care of their own. It is an example of the kind of thing the Federal Government should not be doing.

As absurd as it may sound, this program requires the President of the United States to approve criteria under which Federal grants may be made to localities for construction of necessary sewer treatment works.

If there is one remaining thing which localities should do for themselves, it should be to provide for necessary sewage disposal.

But, here is a Federal appropriation for \$50 million to be passed out in grants—not loans—for this purpose.

It is another program encouraging State and local governments to come to Washington with their hands out.

It results as a penalty on citizens of communities who pay their taxes, sell their bonds, and take care of their own local needs.

The program was started this year under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act. The original appropriation, for fiscal year 1957, was also \$50 million. The budget estimates actual expenditures this year of \$7 million. It estimates also remaining \$43 million will be carried over into fiscal year 1958 as an obligated balance.

Of the new \$50 million appropriation requested for 1958, and provided in this bill, it is estimated that \$26,500,000 will be spent in the coming year, with the remainder to be carried forward for expenditure in fiscal year 1959 or some subsequent year.

Elimination of this new appropriation will not affect any obligations made against the original \$50 million up to June 30; it would simply prohibit further obligations against the new appropriation.

Funds appropriated for these grants are allocated to States and Territories on the basis of population and economic need. Within these allocations grants for specific projects may be made up to 30 percent of the cost of the project, or up to \$250,000, whichever is the smaller. At least 50 percent of funds appropriated go to communities of 125,000 population or less.

Approval and priority of construction projects is established by a State agency on the basis of financial and water pollution control needs. Projects are supposed to conform to the "State Comprehensive Water Pollution Control Plan."

In approving projects, "the Surgeon General of the United States considers the propriety of Federal aid in accordance with criteria approved by the President, the public benefits to be derived by the construction, the relation of the cost of the project to the public interest and necessity, and the adequacy of provision by the applicant for proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction."

This detail is cited as the kind of red-tape in which localities become involved when they take money from taxpayers in other communities, through the Federal Government, to provide for their own "necessary" sewage disposal.

It would seem this is one thing they could do for themselves, without bothering the President of the United States to fix the criteria. It is no wonder taxpayers all over the country are rising up against this budget.

Mr. Chairman, this is \$50 million which can and should be saved. The country will go along just as well without this. The cities and towns, once they learn they cannot go with hat in hand to Washington for some funds to contribute to their local responsibilities, will arrange to solve and pay for their own sewage problems, just as they do with respect to their streets, parks, schools, and the other local services which municipalities are obligated to furnish to the local people.

Let us act instead of just talk about economy. Let us do something about nonessential spending. The American people want to know if we really mean

business about reduced spending. Here is a chance to give them the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman spoke about Federal loans for highways and waterways agricultural grants and every other sort of grants—a grant is a grant. Even if we did make a grant to clean our polluted streams and purify and clean up our waters, I cannot see that there is much difference. It is just as important to clean up our polluted streams as it is to build highways, and highways I agree are important.

But let us not depreciate this particular project and its purposes. This very amendment offers and opportunity to clean up our waters for the use of the people of our Nation. This amendment to reduce the funds for this program is one that the House should carefully consider, as it concerns one of our great resources, water. The water-pollution control and water-supply program of the Public Health Service is a natural-resource program. It is one of the most important resource programs in the whole Federal Government. I understand it takes nothing away from the agencies and programs of the Department of Interior or the Department of Agriculture.

I might say that we are fortunately blessed with great water resources. They must be conserved and protected. It is not economy to permit the waste and destruction of vital natural resources. Too long we have permitted the waste and destruction of our natural waters to go unchecked. Too long we have neglected pollution control at the expense of the national economy and the public welfare.

Now, what is the cost of pollution? The cost is to be measured in lost business and industrial opportunities. How many communities have had to turn away new industries because of inadequate supplies of clean water? The cost is to be measured in damages to farmers because they cannot use the waters of riparian streams for livestock water or irrigation.

The cost is to be found in destroyed wildlife, in lost recreational opportunities, and declining public morale. All of these factors can be as depressing to the economy as the direct loss of industrial and agricultural production through short water supplies.

The market for real estate collapses along the banks of a polluted, sewage-laden stream. The cost is to be counted in declining real-estate values.

Then we must consider the health values along streams, particularly in metropolitan areas of the United States. People today are demanding that they have clean streams and pure water in their areas.

Mr. Chairman, there is no economy in destroying natural resources. The only outcome, when we do neglect our resources, is depression, distress, and the decline of our natural wealth and welfare.

I might say to the Members of the House that it costs money to clean up pollution. We must pay the bill now, and future generations must pay the bill, because we have refused in the past to make the outlays necessary to keep our waters clean.

We have been blessed with great water resources in this great Nation of ours. With the great increase of millions in our population, the demands and pressure for more and clean water become greater. I am sincere when I say to the House today that in my opinion it is a wise investment of the taxpayer's dollar. We must pay the bill. Our children and grandchildren will pay the bill or perish. The Nation cannot survive without water. We have evidence of this all over the world, where water resources have been neglected. We must protect our available water resources today.

The Nation, I want to say, cannot prosper without natural resources, especially water; and, certainly, we want to clean up these dirty, polluted, unhealthy, unsanitary waters and streams and give the American people the benefit of that great natural resource that we have neglected so long—pure water.

Vote carefully on this. This is a conservation issue. The people of America are aroused that something be done to clean up these dirty streams and give them the pure water to which they are entitled.

It is entirely up to you. I shall vote against this amendment.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, or to any other amendment to cripple the long overdue water pollution control program. I yield to no Member of this body in my opposition to waste and to unnecessary cost in Government. But there is another kind of waste that is even more deadly.

I refer to the waste of our natural resources.

In the long run this kind of waste can spell the ruination of our national strength and prosperity.

We are dealing here with the most vital and most basic of all our natural resources—water. I need not remind this body that the water supply situation in this Nation has indeed become critical.

We are proud of our growth and industrial development in America. We look forward to continued progress. But water shortages can well bring our progress to a rude halt. All our spectacular growth and the spectacular new demands of cities, of industry and agriculture for more water have to be considered against the cold fact that we have no increase in overall water supply.

As a matter of alarming fact, our water reserves are dwindling. Underground water tables are falling in many States. Wells and springs are failing.

Watersheds are yielding mud and floods instead of steady supplies of clean water—due to land misuse.

Our cities and industries have been building waste-treatment works—but the trouble is, they haven't been building them fast enough. We are still losing vital water supplies to pollution faster than we are reclaiming them.

From 1920 to 1955 the amount of human sewage escaping untreated into the streams and watercourses of America increased by 30 percent. Today the amount of raw city sewage escaping into public waters is equal to the wastes from 55 million people.

The lag in industry is even greater. In 1920 the industrial wastes being dumped untreated into our streams was equal—in damaging effect—to the sewage from 49 million people. Today it amounts to the sewage from 110 millions.

Pollution makes water unusable. It kills fish and wildlife. It destroys recreational opportunities. It causes new industry to look elsewhere for plant sites. It depresses real estate values. It endangers public health. In short, it cripples America.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, Congress first took realistic action in facing up to this critical problem. We passed Public Law 660. The Natural Resources Council of America, and the National Wildlife Federation, in their reporting services, ranked Public Law 660 among the 2 or 3 most important conservation achievements of the 84th Congress. In the field of water resources, according to the federation, it was the most important action of the last Congress.

The first abatement action under the new law was recently completed. A public hearing was held in the case of oil-well drainage polluting the interstate waters of the Corney Creek system in Arkansas and Louisiana. The offending oil-well operators were ordered to clean up their pollution. They have agreed to comply.

Many polluting industries watched the Corney Creek case as a test of the teeth in the new law. I wonder if the outcome of that case has anything to do with attempts being made now to cripple the program.

I understand the head of the natural resources department of the United States Chamber of Commerce has been working against this appropriation. I wonder if that fact has anything to do with the attitude of some of my colleagues who are supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 660 was passed by this body in the 84th Congress by a record vote of 338 yeas to 31 nays. Some of my colleagues have been quick to claim credit for getting it passed. They were good conservationists during the campaign last fall. I wonder if they are as strong for conservation now, when it comes time to vote the money to make the pollution-control program work?

Mr. Chairman, this is a conservation program. We cannot afford continued waste of a vital natural resource. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to advise the gentleman that is the first information I have had about that. The chamber may have contacted the gentleman from Illinois, but it did not contact me.

Mr. PRICE. The chamber has contacted many Members. I am not saying that the gentleman is anything but sincere in his presentation of the amendment. I do say, however, I am unalterably opposed to it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I may say that I have been contacted by the chamber of commerce against this amendment.

Mr. PRICE. I think many Members have been.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. The letter from the chamber of commerce and the report shows their opinion on this matter.

Mr. PRICE. It is a known fact that there have been many contacts made with numerous Members of Congress in opposition to this very worthwhile, essential, and necessary program for the preservation of our water resources in this country. I urge my colleagues to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it is refreshing and very encouraging to observe the professed interest on the part of many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in reducing Government expenditures. For years and years, when their party was in complete control of both the executive branch and the Congress, we operated under unbalanced budgets, we constantly added to the national debt, and periodically increased taxes to meet the rising cost of Government.

Admittedly, the budget submitted by the President is a sizable one, but it must be noted that it is a balanced budget, with an estimated surplus to apply on the national debt. Suddenly, and notwithstanding, we find the spenders of yesteryears protesting most vigorously against the proposed expenditures required on programs they themselves initiated, which many of us on my side of the aisle opposed.

The provision now under consideration provides for an appropriation of another \$50 million of Federal grants to municipalities to erect sewage-disposal plants. Why is this item in the budget, and why is this item in this bill? It is because the Congress itself, over the opposition of the administration and over the opposition of my side of the aisle, wrote into a bill to extend the Water Pollution Control Act an entirely new program as provided by section 6.

There is no question as to the value and the need for the water pollution con-

trol program as a whole. That is not in issue. The sole matter in issue is with respect to section 6 of the act pertaining to Federal aid to States and municipalities for water-treatment plans.

When we had the bill to extend the Water Pollution Control Act before us, on June 13, 1956, our side of the aisle made a vigorous effort to have section 6 eliminated. It was pointed out at that time that it represented an entirely new grant-in-aid program, that it would be costly, and that it constituted something that municipalities could and should do for themselves without Federal financial assistance.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] led the fight to strike section 6 from the authorization bill. Failing to accomplish this in the Committee of the Whole when the bill was read for amendment, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] offered a motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate the section. There was a record vote. It will be found on page 9240 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13, 1956.

I voted for a motion to recommit and eliminate section 6. Most of those supporting the motion, 165 of us, were from my side of the aisle. Most of those opposing the motion, 213, were from the other side of the aisle.

I am for economy in government. I have always been for economy, and I have always voted for economy. I believe the budget submitted to us can and should be reduced, and I have been consistently voting for cuts. If you are for economy, you do not simply talk it and then vote otherwise.

If the expenditures of the Federal Government are to be reduced, we in the Congress must, first of all, stop initiating new projects and programs, such as was done in the Water Pollution Control Act. Secondly, we must postpone projects or programs, however meritorious, that are not of an urgent necessity. Thirdly, we must examine every item, evaluate its relative merits in relation to other items and the overall budgetary situation, with a view to reducing expenditures to the extent possible, and with a view to eliminating completely the proposed expenditures not necessary.

Now, here is an opportunity to eliminate a \$50 million expenditure that is not necessary. It should never have been authorized last year. There is no reason whatever why the Federal Government should be providing funds to States and municipalities to erect waste-disposal plants. For the most part, the States and municipalities are better able financially than the Federal Government to meet this local need.

Here is a chance to vote for economy. If we strike this section from the bill we will save \$50 million for the next fiscal year and many, many millions more in the years ahead.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this amendment has been offered. I thought it was agreed last year when we passed Public Law 660 that we engaged in a contract with the States of the Union to the effect that we would participate in a program of providing \$50 million annually

for a period of 10 years and that the States would match that \$50 million by some \$150 million annually and construct projects to abate the pollution of their streams.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look for one moment, if you will, at the total investments that the United States has made in its various water-resource programs. Up to the present time the Congress of the United States has voted and appropriated over \$14 billion to utilize one of the greatest natural resources that we have in this country, water. So often, Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that in times of low waterflow we here in the Congress express fear and apprehension of what will happen to the economic situation of our communities if we do not establish a wise and prudent program concerning the use of our water.

Now, we have made a contract with the various States of the Union. The enthusiasm by which the States have accepted this program is indicated by the number of applications that have been received by the Public Health Service. The author of the amendment, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] must have been unmindful of the fact that from his State of Texas alone there have been probably more applicants to become beneficiaries of this program than from any other State in the Union. There are some 37 applications from the State of Texas, and the total cost of those programs is in excess of \$10 million. I cannot think of any State where the necessity is greater than in the State of Texas for the wise use of water to preserve and protect the quality as well as the quantity of the water.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman from Alabama has pointed out that in the State of Texas applications have been filed which would result in a total cost of programs of some \$10 million.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I said approximately \$10 million. At the rate of \$10 million, if approved, that would mean in excess of \$30 million expended in joint enterprises of various communities in the State of Texas and the Federal Government to improve the quality of their water. That is in a State where water users are already having difficulties and where the Federal expense is very great in the building of dams for the impounding of water for the purpose of conserving the water that is now going to waste.

Mr. FISHER. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to suggest to him that I do not speak for the State of Texas. I am only one who is from that State. But speaking for myself, I think we are willing to forego that \$10 million in an effort to reduce Federal spending. And if the State of Alabama and other States will join with Texas in this effort, then we will be able to do something about cutting this budget.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from Texas in being willing to forego great water resources, but I recall that very recently the gentleman

from Texas was intensely earnest and zealous concerning appropriations for the purpose of drought relief in the State of Texas. I assume that this drought relief was made necessary because of the fact that we did not have sufficient water supplies to be able to make proper utilization of the water by the farmers in the State of Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. Then I take it the gentleman associates this kind of legislation and this kind of Federal aid with that having to do with emergencies such as disasters?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course I do, for I find there is no distinction between the quantity and the quality of water. I think it is of paramount importance not only to the Federal Government in its expressed policy of conserving our natural resources, but also to the States in helping to implement this program of water conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sincere in my opposition to this amendment and I want particularly to take issue with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] who contended that this is a problem primarily for the cities and municipalities. I would remind the gentleman that water does not stay within one municipality. We in Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania are presently spending many millions of dollars for sewage-disposal plants. If the rivers above us are not controlled in the same way our efforts are valuable only to the people downstream from us.

Also, I would remind the gentleman that rivers do not stay within any given State. They cross into other States. It seems to me that if there is one place where the Federal Government properly should encourage the municipalities and the States to do a job for the general welfare of all the people of the United States it is in this program.

Further, I would like to point out in regard to the argument which the previous gentleman was making and the distinction he was making between an emergency program and a continuing program, that the University of Pittsburgh has issued studies proving that the loss from disease and death, as well as the resulting economic loss because of low water and polluted water, is greater than the loss from floods. You have, therefore, a continuing emergency in the condition where we are polluting our streams either with industrial wastes or human wastes. It does not make any

difference. This is a proper program. It is a program we need. We should have had it long ago.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would certainly have no disagreement with the gentleman as to water pollution. I do not think anyone in the House does. The question I raise is that this does not affect the Water Pollution Act. What I am talking about, based on the information they gave me downtown, is that the amount provided here is to help in the construction of sewage plants, which the cities themselves could do and have been doing in years past.

Mr. CORBETT. No, I would take issue with the gentleman. Our rivers have become, particularly in summer, simply open sewers. There is no other word to describe them. Industrial pollution is not nearly as detrimental as that is. So what would happen if Wheeling, W. Va., proceeded with a fine program of waste disposal and the city of Pittsburgh did not? You would be polluting that city, just the same as up in Oil City they would be polluting Pittsburgh.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I would say there are about 25 or 30 small communities of from 10,000 to 25,000 population above the city of Pittsburgh, all emptying their sewage into the Allegheny River and going on down to Pittsburgh for your water supply.

Mr. CORBETT. It costs us millions of dollars to clean that water up before we can use it.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman will permit me to call attention to what the President said, since he mentioned the President's program, this is what he said in his state of the Union message:

The whole matter of making the best use of each drop of water from the moment it touches our soil until it reaches the oceans, for such purposes as irrigation, flood control, power production, and domestic and industrial uses clearly demands the closest kind of cooperation and partnership between municipalities, States, and the Federal Government. Through cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities in these vast projects we can obtain the economy and efficiency of development and operation that springs from a lively sense of local responsibility.

Mr. CORBETT. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I am sure he agrees with me that this is a proper Federal expenditure.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly it is a prize investment of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. The gentleman's area is in the 7 or 8 States which have an interstate compact, Pennsylvania, New York, and so forth. Does not the Housing and Home Finance Agency enable these small areas to borrow as much as

a quarter of a million dollars to make plans to build these sewage plants?

Mr. CORBETT. I am sure it does. I am sure this program is to stimulate activity along that line, because many of these communities simply cannot afford to borrow. They need some Federal help and assistance in order to help those that are not able to help themselves.

(Mr. HOLLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was very much surprised to find objections to appropriating \$50 million to be used in grants to municipalities to assist them in building waste-treatment works.

I do not know of any moneys which could be spent more wisely to clean out the pollution which is poured into our streams through human waste, than this amount of money.

Mr. Chairman, the objections of cleaning up our streams is nothing new to me. I fought this battle for many years in the house of representatives and in the senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I was the original sponsor in 1937 of legislation that made possible the existing Ohio River Valley Pure Stream Compact that is now a law and working successfully throughout the entire Ohio River Valley.

When this legislation was introduced, the same arguments which are used today were used then. Industry had their stooges to fight this compact and point out the exorbitant expense it would entail, although what we were doing was trying to clean out the pollution that many of these industries had poured into the river over the years.

Cities and local municipalities are the creation of the State legislators of the 48 States. They are limited to their taxation and their expenditures. In many cases, no new taxes can be levied or charges made for service unless it is through special legislation by their State Legislature. For this reason, many local municipalities have been backward in building disposal plants and still permit their sewers to pour forth pollution and disease, and even death, into the very waters that we drink.

I differ with those who say this is a local expense because rivers do not stop at the boundary of the local municipality or the boundaries of the State. The lower municipalities on the rivers may build costly disposal plants, but this will not correct the pollution of their waters for if municipalities upstream do not do the same thing, the lower municipalities will still receive the same filth they spent so much money to eradicate.

This is a job that the Federal Government should encourage. This is a job in which the Federal Government should share the cost.

All of us are for economy. We are also for progress. And all of us, I am sure, do not want to practice economy at the expense of the very people's health we have the honor to protect.

There is another side to this problem and that is a moral obligation of a contract entered into between the Federal Government and the local municipality.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was an election year and every Member who was in this House had an eye on votes. We passed this bill which created the contract between the Federal Government and the local municipality for the erection of the disposal plants. We made a definite promise that the Federal Government would match the local municipalities with dollars to pay for them.

Many municipalities took our word and made great plans and spent considerable money in surveys, engineering expense, and have drawn up proposals for the building of the actual plants. Now, we say to them that our word was merely the word of a politician before election. We have no intention to carry out our part of the contract.

Water is one of our greatest resources. With the increase in population and the increase of industry, the supply of water is going to be one of our big problems. We are being warned day after day we should conserve water as well as to stop its pollution. Are we, the Members of the 85th Congress, going to go down in the history of this country as not only breaking our word with our constituents in our municipalities but of contributing to stopping the progress which is being made in cleaning up our streams? Your vote will decide that answer.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, during the last session of Congress I had the pleasure, honor, and privilege of serving on the Public Works Committee of this House. In the course of my service on that committee I think one of the most vitally important pieces of legislation brought out by that committee and by this Congress was the Water Pollution Act of last year.

We have heard a good many people rise on the floor of this House and tell us that this program of making Federal grants to the States is not important. Let me tell you how important it is.

During the early 1930's, there was a period when pollution-control programs and the construction of facilities for the control of pollution and the elimination of waste from our streams kept pace with the growth of our population and actually exceeded it. To that extent, at least, we were able to clean up the streams of our country, which had become filthy, open, stinking cesspools. From that time until passage of the water-pollution bill, because of the war, and because of the difficulties of municipalities in securing credit, we had reached the point where we no longer kept pace with our population and with our programs for cleaning up our streams. What is pollution? Pollution is death. It is disease. It is filth. It affects the fisherman. It affects the hunter. It affects the conservationist. It affects the picnicker. But, more than that, it affects the people in the cities, in the towns, in the farms, and in the villages. When you vote against this proposal, you are breaking faith with what the Congress did during the last session and you are breaking faith with the people and with the municipalities who are going ahead in this field and who are attempting to clean up these streams by establishing and creat-

ing these pollution-control facilities to eliminate the foul, filthy waste from our streams. It has been said that this money can and might be used for other purposes. It cannot be used for other purposes. The law says it must be used for the construction of facilities. The Surgeon General is watching this. The program is working well. Recently I had the privilege of questioning the Surgeon General as to how this program was working when he appeared before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He said it was working wonderfully well, and that admission was made in spite of the fact that the Surgeon General opposed this program during the last session of the Congress.

Municipalities which had never done a thing, even though under court order are now cleaning up their pollution. This bill works. Streams rise in one State and flow to the sea. A stream goes through many other States and each of the States and the people along its banks use that water. Everyone is hurt by pollution in a river. When you pay to clean up that water with Federal funds, you pay not necessarily for your own waste but for the waste upstream. Each payment you make is buying for yourself and for your neighbors and for your friends and for your children good, clear water. This program has resulted in over a 25 percent increase in starts in municipal sewage control plants.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The President also stated in his state of the Union message, may I point out for the benefit of my colleagues:

Until such a partnership is established on a proper and logical basis of sharing authority, responsibility and costs, our country will never have the full productive use of water that it so obviously needs and protection against disastrous floods.

So the President is in accordance with this program.

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with my colleague and compliment him for a good statement. What does this program do? We spend \$50 million a year. The streams of this country are so bad today that they are corroding bridges, boats, canal locks. They are eating away the concrete. People spend millions to get pure water or to purify polluted water.

Drive along the rivers. Drive along the Potomac and smell the dirty, filthy sewage that flows through our Nation's Capital—the beautiful Potomac River. Only 22 percent of the cost of these structures is Federal money. The balance is State money. Less than a quarter of the money which goes into any municipal plant on the overall average is Federal money and the balance is State money. What we are doing is greasing the wheels. The municipalities for the first time in many years are finally beginning to go out and finally beginning to construct the municipal sewage-disposal plants which we need so badly. Let me call your attention to one thing. In 1948, the late Senator Taft—and I am sure my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle honor

his name as I do—was the author of a sewage-control bill. Money was authorized in that sewage-control bill for grants to States. That bill and those provisions never worked. The reason was that Congress never appropriated the money.

The effect of that failure by Congress was to hold up and cause real delay by States and municipalities. Here the amendment before us seeks to create the same situation. Yes, it seeks to have the States wait for funds, which Congress is too niggardly to supply. In that will be the failure of the water-pollution bill, and in that will be the failure of this Congress.

A program which is working well is being attacked by an unwise and improvident amendment. It is up to the Congress to keep this money in the bill and to strike down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the spending of \$50 million in Federal funds in this area would accomplish nothing that will not be accomplished without the funds. In other words, I am personally convinced there will not be a single sewage disposal plant built in the United States today that would not be built if we did not appropriate the funds. I had the opportunity of signing \$6 million worth of sewage disposal bonds a year or so before I came to the Congress in my own community. We are paying the whole bill. If you want to make it retroactive, then we would like to get a little bit of this money too.

I have some communities in my own district who are at the present time in line for receiving money from Federal aid for their sewage disposal plants. I say that this \$50 million and that we appropriated last year has done more to deter the solving of the stream pollution problems than anything else. Why do I say that? Simply for this reason: that communities are waiting and waiting to see how many Federal dollars they can get. They will have to float bonds to pay the difference. Just a fraction of the difference in the interest bond rate and a slight rise in construction costs will wipe out every benefit they could possibly receive from Federal money, as far as these sewage disposal plants are concerned.

I find nothing here that cannot be taken care of on the local level or the State level. Our Michigan Water Resources Commission has the law by which they can require local communities to do the job themselves. There is no reason why we should spend \$50 million to do the job. We are all for cleaning up our streams. I do not know of anyone who is not in favor of having adequate laws to force local communities to do the job. But to give them money from the Federal Government is not the solution.

You will not solve the problem that way at all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] spoke of greasing the wheels. When we grease the wheels in this instance, where does the Federal Government get the money to grease the wheels?

Mr. CEDERBERG. We have to take it from the same people we are going to give it back to.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. Irrespective of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] says about the President's message, is it not a fact that the administration vigorously opposed this program?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is exactly right. I do not think he was talking about this subject at all. He was talking about the large flood-control and multipurpose projects.

Mr. SCHERER. As a matter of fact, the administration came before the committee on two occasions and said they were not in favor of it?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is correct. I made it clear in my district that I did not vote for the authorization of the \$50 million, because I thought it was not in their best interests. Even though they are in line for some of the money, I think they have agreed with me.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a magnificent statement, and I hope everybody has gotten the full impression that I have from his statement.

In my own district there are two towns that have received Federal grants. I know that both of them were in a position to sell bonds without increasing the tax burden on the people to pay for these things themselves.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I agree with the gentleman. I say to you that I believe in some of these areas that they have inflicted upon those local communities a delay in the construction of their sewage-disposal plants that will cost them as much as the Federal money they are going to get out of it.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that if we continue this program, instead of costing \$50 million now a year, it is going to be a billion dollars a year in a few years? One instance for instance, Cincinnati, one city, spent in the last few years \$50 million alone to clean up its own sewage. Why should we be taxed through Federal funds to pay for other cities to clean up their sewage? It will cost a billion dollars a year in a short time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not believe this program is any good unless you go into it for a full billion dollars a year. Unless you can do that you ought to stay out of it altogether.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield? How did the gentleman vote on the school-construction program?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I voted for the Eisenhower proposal.

Mr. GAVIN. What did you do last year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we can talk about economy, but indiscriminate cutting of appropriations is not always economy.

I represent a district in Kentucky that borders on the Ohio River for 200 miles. That river has been locked and dammed for the purpose of maintaining a 9-foot stage for navigation. When the water is low, the pools are stagnant. One of the pools extends from Fern Bank below Cincinnati, to Coney Island, above Cincinnati, a distance of about 12 miles. Into that pool goes the domestic sewage of a million people. Into that pool goes the industrial waste of the great industrial area sometimes called the Ruhr of America. Much of that waste is poisonous. Out of the pool comes the water used for drinking and domestic purposes.

The city of Cincinnati has filtration plants built at great cost; however, with all the treatment they can give the water, it is difficult to make it potable or palatable.

The cities on the Kentucky side of the river are unable to establish great filtration and chlorination plants. They are limited as to their indebtedness, as to their tax rate and as to their expenditures by the constitution of the State.

These cities will need assistance. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Unless we have complete control of pollution, we will have practically no control. If any of these cities fail to construct interceptor sewers, which will mean rearrangement of the whole sewer system, and disposal plants the whole program fails.

Thomas Jefferson said of the Ohio River that it was the most beautiful river in the world, abounding in fish and aquatic life. Today, however, it is a series of polluted pools. The fish and aquatic life have gone. The recreational value of the river has almost been destroyed. The law upon the statute books pledges us to attempt to restore the river to its previous condition. It authorizes this appropriation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I merely wish to say to the gentleman that not only in the State of Kentucky but also in my State, Ohio, upriver, there are plenty of communities who cannot afford sewage plants unless they get Federal help in the planning and building.

Mr. SPENCE. I agree with the gentleman. Eight States—New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois have entered into a compact to cooperate and coordinate their efforts to control the pollution of the Ohio River and its trib-

utaries. This is an important compact, but it alone cannot do the work. The States collectively or individually cannot control pollution. All the municipalities must construct interceptor sewers and disposal plants which will prevent the raw sewage from entering the river. If this is not done there will be no adequate control and the river will remain polluted.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Not now. The Government of the United States has constructed in the city of Cincinnati a great laboratory at the cost of approximately \$5 million. They are doing a great work in ascertaining the causes of the pollution of the water and of the air. This is a recognition that this problem is a national problem.

I hope and trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to relate a true story. There is in my district a community populated almost entirely by a first generation of Americans. They came to this continent seeking religious liberty and economic opportunity just before the turn of the century. Many people in that community still speak with a decided accent. But they have built up a very thriving community. They have some manufacturing plants, a wonderful community building, and fine, modern schools and churches. They are a fine, law-abiding group of American citizens, interested in our welfare and contributing greatly to the development of the community and to our State and Nation.

In the 1954 Housing Act, provisions were included authorizing Federal grants to municipalities for public works planning and authorizing low-interest loans. I knew this municipality was interested in building a filter plant because I had read about the plans in the newspaper published in the community. So I sent copies of the new bill to city officials as information. I heard nothing more about the subject until the Congress was in recess in 1955.

When I was visiting the various communities in my district that fall, I came to this one and met with the mayor and the town council. I said, "What happened to your filter plant?" He said, "We have the finest filter plant in this section of the country. People come from all over North Carolina and from elsewhere to look at our filter plant. We want to take you out to see it."

We went out and inspected it. I said, "How much did this filter plant cost?" The mayor said, "\$650,000." I said, "You remember I sent you some literature describing available aid from Uncle Sam but never heard from you and just wonder whether you pursued that matter yourself. Did you get any Federal funds to help build this plant?" The mayor smiled and said, "No, we talked it over and decided that we were going to drink this water ourselves; we could build our own filter plant. So we issued bonds and built it without asking for any help from Uncle Sam."

If that community of first generation Americans can do that for itself, I do not believe there is a community in the United States that cannot build its own filter plant and its own sewage system. I commend the example of this fine North Carolina community to other communities faced with the same problems.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us would not reduce funds that the author of the amendment feels are too large in relation to the overall program. Instead, it would wipe out a particular program that was authorized by the Congress less than a year ago. It would wipe out programing which has begun among many communities toward establishing sewage-disposal plants which would not have been established otherwise. Despite what may be the experience of others and the observations of others, it has been my experience as one member of the committee which authorized this legislation that there are many hundreds of communities throughout the country that would not have established these sewage-disposal plants without the incentive involved in this aid program.

In fact, as one of the direct results of this aid program that has been put into effect there has been more experimentation and more development in different types of disposal plants that are much cheaper than those that have been considered in the past. As the result, many small communities throughout the country that would never have considered the idea of sewage disposal plants before are in the process of applying and developing programs of this type.

This program is essential for a type of water purification that is more than a local problem. If this were a purely local problem, perhaps we would not have to be concerned about it here. But the pollution involved here consists of water being dumped into the streams that flow not only through our individual States but from State to State without any respect to any State border, and the water involved is part of our national heritage, part of our natural resources.

As has been mentioned before, we have spent something like \$14 billion in the relatively few years past working to improve our water resources. We are going to spend in the future, at the rate we did last year and will probably in the years ahead, something like two-thirds of a billion dollars a year, at least, to preserve these water resources. It seems to me that to wipe out this program here would be to lessen our chances of getting the fullest results from this water resource investment that we are involved in and have been involved in and will continue to be involved in in the future. The \$50 million a year proposed here is the limit of the authorization. As has been mentioned by my friend from Ohio, there will not be any increase to a billion dollars a year in this program, and there cannot be unless our committee changes the law. If the committee changes the law, that will be our responsibility. There cannot be any increase in this 10-year program. In fact, the

program now will expire after 9 years unless it is extended at that time, and as far as cost, we are up to the limit of it now. Now, if there appeared to have been some evidence that the entire \$50 million could not have been properly used, I think it would have been proper to offer some amendment to reduce the sum. But, as for wiping out the program, I think the way to do that would have been to come up here and repeal the law. To stop now will interfere with all sorts of local programs that have been instituted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk about programs that were crowded onto us by departments. I want to read a little bit about this one. This is testimony of Secretary Folsom when he was before the Committee on Appropriations holding hearings on this bill, on the opening day of the hearings, February 11. At page 15 he said this:

Some of these programs, of course, were enacted last year without our specific recommendations and some of them went in over our objections. For example, on the water-pollution waste-treatment projects, we did not recommend an appropriation authorization to Congress and that is a \$50 million item.

If we are going to set up programs continuously that call for \$50 million apiece to be allocated to local authorities for the construction of sewers and for other activities, several of them each year, we are going to bankrupt the Treasury of the United States and we are going to make impossible tax reduction. I do not know how you feel about it, but the people of the United States want tax reduction.

I am not opposed to sewer systems. I have been in favor of them in my own community right along. I have helped to put them through. I would help to put any such activity through in my district. But I do not believe that we ought to further embark upon this activity. I think we ought to stop it, and now is the time to stop it, by adopting this amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. When I was a member of the California Legislature I distinctly remember that we participated in the activities of a group called the Committee on Interstate Cooperation. California, in cooperation with our neighboring States, handled this problem on a local level. In the opinion of the gentleman is there any reason why this could not be done nationwide?

Mr. TABER. It can. There is not any reason why the States could not go ahead and take care of their needs along this line. They are in a lot better shape financially than the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Am I correct in my recollection that the President opposed this provision last year?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder where the gentlemen were then who are lecturing us now for not following the President.

Mr. TABER. They are on the other side of the fence just now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that there is not a municipality in America that is in as poor fiscal condition as is the United States of America?

Mr. TABER. There is not any question about that; that is true. Unless we adopt this amendment, we shall make that condition worse. I want to see the United States Treasury get in a better position.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that while for this coming year the program would cost only \$50 million, if we continue this program to cover the entire United States \$50 million will only be a drop in the bucket, and this program could reach the proportions of almost a billion dollars a year; and in that connection I pointed out the fact that it cost 1 city \$50 million to clean up its sewage-disposal problem.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about that at all.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object. (Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it is with some trepidation that I come before you on this amendment offered by my esteemed colleague and valued friend from Texas. In the first place, I am reluctant to do it because I am just as sensitive as any of you to the desire throughout the country for reducing the expenditures of Government and cutting the budget.

I think I have voted for most of the reductions that have been offered on the floor of the House. In addition, I have introduced 4 separate bills to put into effect some of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission and thus to bring about substantial reductions in the cost of Government. Yet I do feel constrained, in spite of that trepidation, to come before you and tell you the result of my own thinking about this particular matter. Because it deals with the Nation's water supply, I think it is terribly important.

Prior to coming to Congress, I had the privilege of serving for some 4½ years as mayor of a small municipality, and during part of that time it was my privilege to be president of the League of Texas Municipalities, which comprises some 670 such city governments. As the result of that experience, I have come to the inescapable conclusion that the one

single most important item for the future of America is this commodity that you see here in this glass, water, clear, usable water.

Everybody has heard the old adage that a politician thinks about the next election while the statesman thinks of the next generation. For just a minute, let us think about that next generation.

At the rate at which our population is growing and at the rate at which our per capita consumption of water is growing we may well become a have-not Nation in water, this most vital of all resources, in some 25 or 30 years. Texas, a dry State, is only 20 percent larger in population than it was 10 years ago, but it is using today 2½ times as much water as it was 10 years ago. This is true in only slightly varying degree throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this cut would be false economy. If it were a question of reducing the proposed expenditure by \$10 million or \$12 million, I think I would look with favor upon such an amendment, but to eliminate this entire program which less than a year ago this House authorized after lengthy debate would, I think, be to take a big step backward in our determination to clean up the streams of this country.

Let me point out that this program is not a boondoggle nor an indiscriminate giveaway. In order to qualify for one of these matching grants, a city must prove to the satisfaction of both the State health department and the Federal Public Health Service that its proposed facility will contribute effectively to the control of pollution now infesting and infecting our streams. In addition, the experience to date shows that the cities applying for these grants have been raising about \$4.50 locally for every \$1 pledged by the Federal Government.

It has been asked, Why is it that the cities cannot do this job themselves? I think that is a fair question and one which deserves a fair answer. The answer is that the cities of America, the municipalities, the local governments, are in a terribly persistent financial squeeze between rising costs of doing business and serving their people and limited sources of revenue. The cities legally are the creatures of the State. They have been properly called the orphan children of American government. Unlike the Federal Government or a State government, municipal governments cannot simply invent a new tax to pay for these services. They are limited by State law as to the sources of the revenue they may derive to serve the needs of their people.

More and more and more cities throughout the country have been having to defer such necessary things as sewage treatment plants for the burgeoning growth of their cities because of the fact that in many areas the State law, for one thing, has limited the amount of the bonds they may sell to 10 percent of the overall appraised valuation of their properties. Practically all cities are growing. They have had to bond themselves to the hilt for bigger schools, more pavement, new water lines,

more adequate parks, police, and fire protection. They have been among the chief victims of the hard money policy. Most of them desperately want to clean up their streams, but many simply cannot without some measure of assistance.

A year ago we came in with this pollution-control program. It is like a family saying to its children, "You are growing, you need clothes that will fit you today. Here is what we will do. You go get a job and you bring in \$4 and we will match it with a dollar, and you can buy yourself something that will fit you for Easter." The cities have responded beyond our expectations.

For us now perfunctorily to do away with the program after there has been such spontaneous enthusiasm on the part of the cities would be like the parents in that same family saying, "Look, this program has worked too well. There is too much interest. You kids have raised too much money. Therefore, we are going to discontinue it and you cannot have that suit of clothes this year."

They cannot all have adequate sewage disposal facilities in the immediate future under this bill, but some can. I am convinced that it is important for the future of this country that we do what we can to stop the pollution, which has so far reduced streams which once ran pure and fresh and clear to corrupted cesspools which are endangering the health and harming the future and serving as roadblocks across the path of progress for much of our Nation.

I urge that you vote against this amendment.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Texas to cut out completely the \$50 million appropriation under the new national policy Congress adopted last year of helping local communities fight the water pollution problem through allocations of grant-in-aid funds for waste treatment works and sewage-disposal plant construction.

Mr. Chairman, the question here is not whether we are amending the water-pollution-control program, but whether we completely repeal the \$50 million a year under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act which this House passed on June 13, 1956, after turning down a motion to recommit or kill the bill prior to final passage, by a vote of 213 to 165. A majority of this House said firmly to the executive department and to the local governments, "We adopt as a national policy the enlargement and extension of the water-pollution-control program by enacting Public Law 660 of 1956, whereby section 6 there is authorized \$50 million a year to a total authorization of \$500 million in 10 years."

Mark D. Hollis, Chief of the Division of Sanitary Engineering of the Department, came up before the House Appropriations Subcommittee and on February 15, 1957, said this:

We have been in operation about 3 months, and now have 771 projects that are

in our regional offices or at the State level. Of these, 83 have been approved. This figure is changing daily. As of today we have committed \$5.5 million, that will support a \$23 million construction program.

That means that under this fine and progressive water-pollution-control program we have already 771 projects on the drafting boards or are completely planned, that the local communities are spending their money upon, relying and expecting you men and you ladies in Congress to live up to your word that you are for this program, as just authorized in 1956, with such improvements as appear necessary from time to time, and that you will not reverse your decision and knock the program on the head within about 9 months of passing the legislation.

When the United States Congress authorizes such a longtime program after full debate, we must make a provision that the States and the localities and communities can depend on.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman to hear his view.

Mr. LAIRD. I just want to state to the gentleman that for any of these projects that have been approved and that are on the drawing boards, the money will be paid for out of the fiscal 1957 appropriation and are not affected by this appropriation.

Mr. FULTON. That is correct for the very few approved, but as the gentleman well knows, when only 83 have been approved as of February 15, 1957, out of 771 projects, and many local communities are putting up the tax money and these programs are already on the drafting boards and have much time, effort, planning, and money expended on such proposed programs, all depending on the legislation passed by this Congress in 1956, to encourage just such local community participation and action and expansion of the pure-streams program. Who will pay these preliminary expenses of local communities, and what is the loss to the Federal Government if this program is suddenly cut completely? Also think of the tremendous loss in health through polluted water, and industrial losses through filtering costs in congested areas in all industrial regions. Pure streams and good clear drinking water are blessings to the United States people that should not be postponed by Congress.

Another point is this—we must realize that not since 1900 has this country even kept up treatment correction to equal the increasing pollution rate because every year since 1900 the pollution of water and streams has gotten worse in the United States. What a dismal record which strong congressional support in both parties, pleads for Congress to return to. God gave you these wonderful hills, these plains, these rivers, these clean, pure streams. Why should Congress not continue the fine pollution-control program that in cooperation with local municipalities and State governments will give them back to our citizens?

Theodore Roosevelt was a great conservationist Republican, and I belong in that conservationist and pure-streams wing of the Republican Party.

We in Pennsylvania are proud of the accomplishments in conservation of our national resources, preservation of our national parks, and pure-stream program and support of many Pennsylvanians, including Senator Edward Martin, Gifford Pinchot, that other great conservationist from Pennsylvania, my friend, John M. Phillips, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

We want these clear, pure, fine streams. I do not want children and families living alongside open sewers such as many stretches of the Ohio River, and other industrial rivers.

Here is some indirect news for the gentleman from Ohio as to Cincinnati. There is the Congressman from Youngstown, Ohio, who is strongly urging a new dam for the west branch of the Mahoning River, Ohio, above Cincinnati. This Youngstown Congressman maintains that the rivers around the Youngstown area are nothing but filthy, open sewers because there is not water to move the sewage away. Therefore the proponents believe one of the benefits of the new proposed dam will be that in the Youngstown area they will have low-flow control which means that in the summer months when water is short, the sewage and industrial wastes of the Youngstown area will simply move on down to Cincinnati, Kentucky, West Virginia, Illinois, and Indiana and not be treated under this program in the Youngstown area. The horrid joke is that Cincinnati is already treating her own sewage and wastes with its own plant, and the Congressmen from the Cincinnati area are here blocking us from Pennsylvania in helping the Youngstown, Ohio, area clear up its streams under this program, so that they will continue to pollute the downstream Ohio area around Cincinnati. At the same time, these Ohio Congressmen favor the proposed dam for the west branch of the Mahoning River in Ohio upstream from them which will admittedly bring down the sewage from Youngstown at Federal expense to repollute the Ohio River that the good taxpayers of Cincinnati have just cleaned up. We in Pennsylvania are proceeding ourselves to clean up our sewage, industrial and mining wastes and sewage is just one kind of waste.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I am sorry but I cannot yield at this time as I have so little time.

Sewage is one kind of pollution. Another kind of waste is industrial waste from manufacturing and chemical plants that pollute the streams. Also there are mine wastes. We have many mines around Pittsburgh and we are trying to make them clean up and stop dumping their sulfur-laden chemicals into the streams. Another kind of pollution is the algae. These are the microscopic plants, that combined with bacteria, and phenols from industrial production, get into the rivers and make the water taste so bad, in Ohio, as well as other States.

Mr. Hollis said in this particular on February 15, 1957, that the Federal Government has worked on the problem quite a bit in a plant the Department has in Cincinnati to remove the bitter taste in the Ohio River water that comes in summertime, in order of course to try to make the water supply in Cincinnati as well as other cities, to taste better. So maybe the citizens of Cincinnati and Ohio River towns would want to ask some people here why they do not want good tasting water for drinking purposes, for family and home use.

Another kind of pollution is the atomic energy production which causes pollution by radioactive and fissionable materials. Let me explain that this is an unknown danger to you gentlemen in these lower river States, below Shippingport, in Pennsylvania, where we have the first commercial atomic reactor plant now going in there. In Congressman Tom JENKINS' district in Ohio, there is building a tremendous new plant for atomic and fissionable materials using tremendous amounts of river water and discharging it again into the streams. Such new type plants and dangerous wastes are going to be erected all around the country.

Why should not the United States continue its fine program for pure streams and clear water in the face of the tremendously increasing problems of pollution from all such kinds of waste and foreign materials? I hope every sportsman and wildlife association and conservationist group in the United States will awaken to these real challenges and join with their fellow conservationists in this House to meet the growing threat to the greatest of our natural resources in this United States; our water, our streams, our rivers, our forests, fields, and watersheds.

We must have Federal research to show how these waste materials in our streams will affect the various towns and cities, and also the natural watersheds, forests and farms. We in Pittsburgh and in all of Pennsylvania have ourselves been cleaning up the rivers and streams in our industrial and mining areas where before, if a person touched his hand or body into the water it turned a greenish brown. Now a person can actually fish along the downtown waterfronts in Pittsburgh, but our rivers are still polluted with sewage of our own, and many river towns above us.

I ask every one of you Congressmen who is interested in good conservation and pure streams not to knock this water pollution control program on the head and repeal it by this unfortunate amendment, but to give the program the money requested to carry it on as authorized by this House and the Congress only last year. Water and stream pollution must go.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the debate on this amendment, as in so many other matters that have come up since I have been a Member of Congress, I have noticed time and again until it has become obvious whenever we have an authorization bill of any sort before the House the debate

and argument is always made that it is not an appropriation; that it is just an authorization, and it will have to go before the Appropriations Committee and before the House to determine how much money can be spent. Then, when the appropriation bill comes before the House the argument is advanced that by the authorization bill we have made a contract, and we have to appropriate the money to carry it out. We always have that conflict, blaming the appropriation upon the authorization; it is a vicious circle, and we are confronted with the same thing today.

I have observed statements made here about the difficulty of the cities raising money to build sewage plants. Down in our part of the country our cities vote revenue bonds and get the money and build them. All of us who use the sewage plant pay every month in sewage fees to the city, and in that way discharge the bonds. It is done without this 20 cents on the dollar support from the Federal Government.

Most of the debate I have heard on this particular amendment has not been directed to city sewage at all. It has been talking about the water pollution of all sorts. Everybody is against water pollution. In my State we have State laws against pollution. I am opposed to paying anybody a bribe to do something that they ought to do anyway. I might go along if you propose a law to prohibit and make it a penalty for anybody to put pollution, whether cities or otherwise, into an interstate stream. I think you would be getting somewhere that way instead of bribing somebody to do something that they should do anyway.

I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] who offered the amendment had more that he wanted to say and I want to yield to him.

Mr. FISHER. It should be emphasized that whereas there has been a lot of talk about this particular section 6, apparently being the whole pollution program, it should be pointed out that under Public Law 660, section 6, represents probably 1 page out of 10, and I should like to commend the gentleman, and I think he is absolutely correct, that most of the towns I am familiar with, where the gentleman and I come from, either already have a sewage system or are quite capable of financing payments for their own.

Mr. DOWDY. Through revenue bonds.

Mr. FISHER. We have authority in our State to do it. Under Texas laws the cities have ample authority to raise the necessary money to pay for their sewage systems.

Mr. DOWDY. Am I correct in this: It appears to me that the gentlemen who have been opposing the gentleman's amendment have been talking about an entirely different part of the Water Pollution Control Act?

Mr. FISHER. I think that is true. Certainly I think most of us would subscribe 100 percent to most of the things that have been said about the evils of pollution. But this section 6 is one phase of the public law which deals with this subject in general. Certainly the individual States and communities have

in the past; they can in the future, they can now certainly finance the problem so far as enlarging or expanding their sewer systems is concerned.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman from Texas states that section 6 authorization for grants is just a small part of the whole bill. It is just about as small as the heart is to the body, but it is the heart of the whole program. Without section 6 the whole program is as ineffective as the entire Federal water pollution control program has been for the last 9 years.

Mr. DOWDY. But you must admit it is a fundamental duty of each industry, municipality, or person, to obey the law, and avoid pollution of our streams. They should not have to be bribed to perform that obligation.

Mr. FISHER. There are 14 sections in the Pollution Control Act. Section 6 is just 1 of the 14. Certainly stream pollution control is not dependent on section 6.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reason we have this bill before us today and the amendment calling for an appropriation of \$50 million is that the pollution law passed some 8 or 9 years ago had to be reenacted. Last year we were called upon to renew the pollution control law of the United States to protect downstream water users. That was the only reason this bill was before the Congress.

But an idea was injected when this bill came up for reenactment, that it would be a nice thing for Uncle Sam to start building the sewage disposal systems for the various cities throughout the United States.

It is my contention that the cities are responsible for their water systems, their streets, and their lighting systems, and so forth; and by every reason in the world they should be responsible for seeing that the water that flows from their cities goes on downstream as pure as it came into their cities; and that can be done by the construction of proper disposal and purification systems.

In the embarking on this program covered in this bill we have done many things besides putting up \$50 million a year for a job the cities are well able to take care of themselves.

However, we have provided for research and assistance to the cities and counties throughout the country an amount of \$100,000 a year to establish fellowships in universities for the purpose of exploring the better planning and development of the program.

We have also provided in section 5 as follows:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, \$3 million for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

This bill was introduced for the very purpose of extending the law to force

the people upstream to take care of the sewage they dump on their neighbors downstream.

I think this is a program we got into by mistake. I was very much opposed to this appropriation in the committee; I opposed it in the Committee of the Whole, and I opposed it before the House when the bill was up for consideration.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think, was not quite fair in quoting the rollcall figures on this bill. On passage we voted for it because it had some very good objectives. But the important rollcall in the House was on the motion to recommit, where the yeas were 165 and the nays were 213. So the vote was not anywhere near unanimous on this \$500 million that is set up for this program.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Did the gentleman ever hear at all about any reclamation projects and water-conservation projects in California I have been voting for to help you boys out since I have been a Member of Congress?

Mr. SCUDDER. Yes. This has a different aspect.

Mr. BAILEY. There was the Central Valley, for instance.

Mr. SCUDDER. If you will allow the State to buy it back you would make a lot of us very happy; as far as I am concerned, I would vote to return the Central Valley project to the State of California. The biggest mistake California ever made was when the State engineers got panicky during the giveaway days and made a deal with the Federal Government to take over the Central Valley project. There has been discussion and turmoil during most of the time since the turnover.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman will have to admit he is in the minority in that respect in California.

Mr. SCUDDER. I doubt it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how other Members of the House recall the debate in the last session on the Water Pollution Control Act, but to my way of thinking, it was one of the most constructive, one of the most illuminating, and one of the best presented to this House which I have had the pleasure of listening to. The gentleman from Minnesota and other members of the committee who brought that bill to the floor had a complete documentation for their case that this program was absolutely essential and necessary in the industrial areas of our country. To me the ever-growing menace and problem of water pollution they very well supported and substantiated. I think they made it clear that it was just as important to reclaim the water resources of the industrial sections of our country as it was to carry forward the great reclamation projects of the West, which I have been happy to support and which I will continue to support in the future. I think we were convinced on the basis of the case presented to the 84th Congress that it was a good, sound program and

that in order to have it an efficacious program it was not only necessary that we put the law on the books but that we provide the money for it and the enforcement provisions for it that were also an integral part of that law. On each test vote on the floor of this House, the efforts to cut out the heart of this bill were decisively defeated by the House. I have not heard today in support of this amendment any evidence to indicate that the water-pollution problem is less serious than it was a year ago. I have not heard any indication or evidence that the municipalities are better able today or the cities are better able today to meet this problem than they were in 1956. I think the evidence is all the other way.

The problem is becoming more serious day by day. In my own section of Oklahoma the industrialization problem and the problem of water pollution are daily becoming more serious. It is becoming more and more important that we have this program and have it in full effect at the earliest possible date. Why back up now? Why tell these communities, that have gone ahead on the strength of this legislation with plans, with engineering studies and with the investment of tax money to get ready for this program, that we did not mean what we said in 1956, that that was something for us to run on in November 1956. We went out, Democrats and Republicans alike, on the campaign front and we said that among the solid achievements of the 84th Congress was the Water Pollution Control Act. Men in districts all over the United States campaigned on that principle. We told the people of the West, of the East, and of the Midwest: We are proud of this achievement, this is something that was done that is sound, good, and constructive for the country. And we ask you to send us back to Congress because of this legislation and other legislation like it. Now we come here in the 85th Congress, with the election a few months behind us, and once again we have people saying "Let us strike the heart out of this program." I do not believe this Congress is ready to take the funding out of this proposition. I do not believe the Congress is ready to cut the heart out of the Water Pollution Control Act, and I think the House of Representatives today in its wisdom will say we meant what we said in 1956; we meant what we said when we told the communities to go ahead and make plans for these programs and you will have our support and the money to carry on the Federal part of the load, and we mean it today as we meant it in 1956; we will continue this program and we will keep this program operating and fund it with Federal financing.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call attention to the fact that thirty-odd years ago I lived by the side of the greatest open sewer in the world. That was the Illinois River at that time. Today that river is practically clean. Chicago today has the reputation and the name of having the finest sanitary district sewage disposal plant in the world, 98.5 per-

cent perfect. Chicago paid out probably between \$100 million and \$200 million to build that sanitary district sewage disposal plant. They taxed their people for it. Now the State of Illinois says to the cities all along the river, "You must build sanitary sewage disposal plants," and they are doing it, and my little city of 5,000 voted \$350,000 of bonds to build its sewage disposal plant, and it is three-fourths built without any aid from the Federal Government.

Now, then, you are asking in this bill that the people of Chicago, who taxed themselves, and the people of other cities who have taxed themselves and have built their sewage disposal plants to help pay for the cities that have not done so far. That is the problem that is before this Congress today.

(Mr. BURLESON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I trust you will indulge me to speak a word of commendation about the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on the manner and conduct in handling this measure. I want to commend him in the highest possible terms as a Member of this House of Representatives who is so thoroughly devoted and conscientious in what he does. It is unexcelled by anyone in this body. In his defense of this bill he has been so very gracious and, I know, thoroughly and wholly conscientious in his every effort and those efforts are extremely able. He is rendering a great service not only to his people but to the Nation as well. The gentleman from Rhode Island spoke a fundamental truth a few days ago when he said, we, the Congress, have bought many services and projects in past years and now the bill is due—they must be paid for. His statement is true and we cannot escape it. We have bought a lot of these things over the years and we are still buying them; and this was one of them last year. This is the grant in aid to States that we are all getting. We are for economy for some other place, but not in our own area. Now, Mr. Chairman, many things are desirable but not always necessary. This is one of many. The authorization is on the books but I see no reason why we could not cut this item out and at least wait until the Federal Government can afford it. True, I have been opposed to it in principle and voted against the authorization last year but even if you are for it, agree that these expenses of Government must be cut now and wait for a better time than the present to hand out this kind of money to cities and towns.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] that he, of course, spoke the truth when he said that towns and municipalities, counties, and State government are no more able this year to bear the burden of the expense of cleaning up their water systems and their sewage-disposal plants that they were last year. I am sure that is true. But surely he would not contend that the Federal Government is any more able now, or was

any more able last year, to do the same thing. If the Federal debt means a thing in the world—and I know some people will argue that it does not mean anything—there is not a municipality in anyone's district, including my own, which is not more able to take care of their problems in this respect than is the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, just over across the river in Alexandria, Va., is a case in point of a city meeting its responsibility. They had suits threatened against them, and then they did something. They tell me a very bad situation existed over there. Their board of commissioners—I believe that is what they call them—was threatened with some very drastic action unless they did something about polluting the streams below their city. They did do something about it. If I owned property in one of these towns, and they did not do something about dumping sewage, I would get me a lawyer.

Here is something else that I know has happened. This situation was not in my area, and not even in my State, but I happen to know about it. I visit there sometimes. I shall not call the name of the place; it might reflect on it, but it is a good example. There is an industrial plant located there. You cannot drive down a beautiful stream into which this plant dumps its untreated waste, without almost having to hold your nose. As the gentleman from Kentucky said, what happened here is what happened to a large part of his country. The town's people seemingly do not want to do anything about it, because this plant means a great deal to the town, and they are not going to complain about it. So it continues to exist. I have an idea this is the case in many places, so they are willing for it to become the responsibility of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:15 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my voice to others who have spoken before me to the effect that in the consideration of this bill Members by and large have been gracious to one another and have been trying as best they could to resolve some of these differences. I think it is obvious to all of us that there is in the country a real concern about the size of the Federal budget, a desire that that budget be reduced, if such can be accomplished hav-

ing regard to the best interests of the country. On the other hand, and certainly in connection with this particular bill, I am sure we all realize that we are dealing with many sensitive areas with a great humanitarian appeal. The things that are sought to be done with the items of appropriation in this bill do have a great appeal. I am sure every one of use is conscious of that fact.

However, I think also we are coming face to face with a clear realization that all of these various services and projects which people would like to have, cost money, and when funds for them are put into the appropriation bill, then of necessity the appropriation is larger than it would otherwise be.

Let me ask you this question: Are we not at this juncture put to the necessity of determining which of these things we might forgo for another day, not holding that they are not good, that we would not like to have them, but that as of today we just do not see how we can afford them?

There was great controversy about section 6 of this extension. It was added in the House committee. It provided for the direct grants. It provided for the \$50 million that is here found in the bill. And may I say parenthetically, there have been charges and countercharges about who has been responsible for the enactment of the authorization measures that bring about these appropriation items.

Let me point out to you again, as it has already been pointed out, that this is one item you cannot charge to the administration because the administration held that section 6 should be properly deleted from the bill, and there was a substantial volume of opinion here in support of that position. The teller vote on the Dondero amendment to strike out section 6 was 112 for and 118 against. That certainly was no decisive vote.

So here we are. As far as I am concerned, I have looked this over. I went back and read as best I could the debates that went before. I know every one of us wants our streams to be pure. No one realizes any more than I that water is one of our greatest resources and one day we may have water shortages in places where today we are more concerned about floods. But even realizing that I have come to the conclusion that here is a program, no matter how much it has to recommend it, that should be terminated for the present. In a better day, when the country may be in a little better shape financially, when the demands for national defense at home and abroad are not so great, then we can again turn our minds to this. But here is an item, may I say to you, that involves the potential of a lot of money. It is not just a flyspecking operation. Certainly, to delete this item interferes with a program that a lot of people think is good. I think it is good, though I still believe it is primarily a matter of local and State concern and responsibility, as was held by those who debated this measure a year ago.

As far as I am concerned, I am going to support this amendment as one place where we can call to the attention of

the people of this country, if nothing else, that these programs do cost money, that we cannot have them all without paying for them, and if the people want economy in Federal expenditures the only way to cut is to cut. This is a place where I think we can and should make a cut.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 5:30 o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota is chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings and reported out this bill. He has probably done more work in this legislative field than any other man in the history of the Congress. I, for one, appreciate the great efforts he has made in espousing this legislation which has meant so much to the health and general prosperity of this country. I think the gentleman is to be commended for his outstanding and splendid work in this important legislative field.

Mr. BLATNIK. I most sincerely appreciate the kind and generous remarks of the gentleman. I must acknowledge for the record that if it were not for the splendid support from many colleagues from both sides of the aisle and from all sections of the country passage of this first important piece of Federal legislation on water-pollution control would not have been possible.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], pointed out that not since the year 1900 have we had any effective water-pollution control either Federal, State, or local. The problem has been getting worse day by day and year by year and month by month. It is worse today than it was yesterday and it was worse yesterday than it was last June or July, as the gentleman from Oklahoma so ably expressed it. At no time in the past 57 years has construction of sewage-control facilities kept up with the demand except for one brief period of years in 1932, 1933, and 1934, a quarter of a century ago. This was the first start on a problem that is already a national problem in 1 out of 8 major cities in over 66 areas of the country involving over 18 million people. Yes, in your State of Texas in all but 6 of the 254 counties, it is an emergency, a disaster, a crisis. I say that the pollution of water is a waste of water.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. I would just like to point this out to the gentleman. While this section 6 is associated, I think, by most of the Members with stream pollution, many of these 254 counties are not even on running streams. Some of these grants that I know have been made to cities that are far away even from a running stream. I do not see how you

can associate that legislation and that problem with all of this talk that has been going on here this afternoon.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is associated in this way. Pollution is a waste of water. Water is fixed. It is constant. We have as much water today as we had in 1900 or as we had in 1620, and we have more people using more water per person as well as more industries using more water. The industrial growth has been tremendous. Ten times the water is used today by industry than was used 25 years ago. It will be doubled in the next 15 years, you see. So, as we use more water from a fixed source, we pollute more of the water because there is less to use. And so it goes around and around in a chain of reaction that eventually in a short period of time will make water not only a national problem but a crisis—which I must say exists already.

Mr. Chairman, any attempt to cut the appropriation for water pollution control activities and sewage treatment work construction, if successful, will have serious and costly effects in the not too distant future.

Last year, when the Committee on Public Works took up consideration of the bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, I consulted with many experts in the field of water resources conservation and development. We found, after considerable study and public hearing, that of all the phases of the problem of water conservation most neglected, the control of pollution topped the list. In essence we created an overall spectrum band to discover what the overall water problem entailed and where pollution and its control fit in.

Along with many others, we found two very disturbing facts. One is, as a recent New York Times survey has indicated, that the United States is confronted with a water supply problem that poses serious questions for the future growth of the Nation. There is the imminent danger that the Nation's future growth will be limited due to a water shortage. The second fact was that while considerable attention was being paid to most aspects of the water resources conservation and development problem one area seemed to be almost totally ignored—and that was the problem of pollution. We have spent billions storing water, damming it, conserving it while at the same time allowing the pollution problem to steadily worsen. For that reason we enacted Public Law 660 last year. It, in effect, puts the pollution problem on equal footing with other serious water resource problems and for the first time we have the machinery to begin to cope with the problem.

The demand for water, Mr. Chairman, has increased immensely while the supply has remained relatively constant. Stated simply, that is the water resources problem in a nutshell—relatively constant supply and an ever increasing demand.

The increased demand for water comes about because of increased population, population shifts, expanded industrial production, increased irrigation and rec-

reational uses, and increases in waste transportation.

In 1900 our population was 76 million people. They used 5 billion gallons of water a day. In 1955 our population was 165 million. They used 22 billion gallons of water a day. In other words, a little over twice as many people required four times as much water. By 1975 our population will be in the range of 225 million persons who will use 37 billion gallons of water each and every day of the year. In the meantime, our water supply remains constant while our population figures explode upward.

Consider for a moment the increased demand on water resources due to increased industrialization. In 1900 some 15 billion gallons of water were used each day—and that is self-supplied, not including water obtained from public supplies. Since then, our industrial production has increased over 900 percent, more than half of which has been since 1940, and today American industry consumes 120 billion gallons of self-supplied water each day and by 1975 our industrial machine will require 246 billion gallons each day. By 1975 our industrial capacity will be double the 1950 levels. Yet the supply of water is constant.

Take the increased use of water for irrigation purposes. In 1900 we were irrigating 7.7 million acres which required 20 billion gallons of water each day. In 1955 we were irrigating almost 4 times as much land—29.5 million acres. Yet we used 6 times more water on those acres—120 billion gallons each day. By 1975 we will be irrigating 37.4 million acres requiring 170 billion gallons of water a day.

Add to this the increased recreational use of water and the increase in waste transportation and you arrive at the startling conclusion that by 1975 this country will require an increase in the current water supply of 145 percent—equal to the additional supply of 145 New York City's, requiring the flow of about 11 Colorado Rivers.

How then can we permit the waste of water? Yet that is exactly what pollution is: Polluted water is wasted water and we do not have a drop to waste.

I am sure the people living in the increasing number of areas suffering water shortages will bear me out. And today there are some 66 such areas affecting over 18 million people. Think of it: 18 million people living in water shortage areas and yet there are those here this afternoon who would eliminate a program designed to conserve and increase our water supply.

Mr. Chairman, unless we tackle this water pollution problem, and tackle it hard, we are going to be in very serious trouble in a few short years. Pollution is one of the largest contributors to our present and future water resources problem and we must recognize that its control is one of the most effective and economical water conservations measures.

The pollution problem has gone from bad to worse, even under the original Pollution Control Act of 1948. Both municipal and industrial pollution has greatly increased.

In 1920, 48 million people were served by sewers and wastes had a population equivalent of 42 million persons. Today 95 million are served by sewers and wastes have a population equivalent of 55 million persons. By 1935 an estimated 160 million persons will be served by sewers with wastes having a population equivalent depending on what we do about pollution in the interim. And what has been our progress in supplying facilities for the treatment of these wastes? Right now, as this debate goes on, there is a need for 9,255 municipal treatment projects.

The picture is even darker regarding industrial waste. In 1920 organic wastes discharged by industry had a population equivalent of 50 million persons. Today that is more than doubled. Organic wastes discharged by industry has a population equivalent today of 110 million persons. By 1975 we know that our present industrial capacity will be doubled. The amount of pollution, Mr. Chairman, will again depend largely on what we do today and in the years to come in the field of pollution control. A 1955 survey by the Public Health Service shows a total of 5,700 treatment projects needed by industry.

To combat especially the municipal pollution problem, Mr. Chairman, section 6 of what is now Public Law 660 was included in the bill. We had a tough fight to hold that section in the bill, and it would appear that our opponents have not given up for the very people who opposed section 6 last year for one reason or another now have as their battlecry, "Cut the budget."

The appropriation bill before us appropriates \$50 million for the next fiscal year for the construction of municipal sewage-treatment plants. The need for such Federal aid cannot be denied. Excepting the period 1933-1939, when Federal public works monies were available, in no year has the construction of sewage treatment works kept pace with the growth in population. By 1956 the backlog of needed municipal sewage construction had risen to 9,255 projects. That is just the backlog. To keep the Nation merely from falling further behind, Federal aid is needed.

Federal aid to communities for sewage treatment work construction has been in effect only since last July. And already we hear that the program is a failure and that it should be eliminated. The logic of those proposing the eliminate escapes me. Time and again I have heard the argument that "\$50 million isn't enough so do not give them anything." The argument is that some communities are holding back waiting for Federal funds and this is hampering progress in treatment work construction. All will agree that in the less-populated States sewage-treatment construction has been vastly increased by the grants made available under the new act. However, in some of the more populated States there has not been enough money to satisfy all communities which applied for it. This has led to the contention in some quarters that such communities would have begun construction if the grants were not available, or are holding

back construction until they can receive the grants. It should be pointed out that the only reason applications were received from all these communities in the more populated States is the fact that construction grants were made available. Many of the communities would have shown no inclination to move ahead at the present time without the stimulus of the Federal act. Thus, instead of slowing construction it has stimulated planning and thinking and shown that there is a need and desire to build treatment works. Further, with the relatively poor status of the municipal bond market, it is remarkable that sewage treatment works construction has been continuing, at its present high level. The Bond Buyer—the bible of the bond market—in its published index shows that the current municipal bond rate is 3.12 percent, while 1 year ago the rate was 2.58 percent. This is caused by a general nationwide rise in costs.

This I think can only be attributed to the impetus given such construction by the new grant program.

Since we have all these applications for grants and not sufficient funds in many of the States to meet the demand, is the solution to cut the grants off completely or to consider raising the appropriation to meet this demand? I think this request is modest indeed to continue the great stimulation in sewage treatment construction started under the Federal act. Cutting these funds when this program has just barely had time to get started would be catastrophic and would completely thwart the efforts of the Congress to meet the critical national problem of protecting and improving the quality of our water resources.

From all over the country are coming reports of applications for grants far exceeding the State allocation. In my own State of Minnesota, the Minnesota Department of Health in its quarterly report states:

A total of 44 applications for grants requesting \$2,727,868 were received during the quarter. These requests represent a total construction cost for sewage treatment facilities of \$9,082,000. Minnesota's allocation of funds for this fiscal year is \$929,000 or approximately 34 percent of the amount requested in the applications.

Out of 44 applications, Minnesota only had enough for the first 9 on the priority list of eligible projects. Most other States are experiencing a similar influx of requests which can only partly be met. Is this cause to eliminate the program? That is thinking backward. Rather it is cause to increase it as is usually the solution when what you have is not enough.

Actually, excellent progress has been made in the construction grants program even with the limited amounts available.

As of March 25, 1957, projects have been approved and grant offers made to 237 municipalities or other applicants in 40 States. Involved are \$84.5 million estimated construction costs and \$19.9 million in Federal grant funds.

Many States have a backlog of applications involving grant funds considerably in excess of their 1957 fiscal-year

allotments. Twelve of these States have reported applications involving requests for grants from 2 to 5 times their 1957 fiscal-year allotments. In all, applications have been submitted to States for projects estimated to cost in excess of \$416 million. An additional number of applications are reported to be in preparation involving about \$45 million in estimated construction costs.

Can anyone still argue there is not a need for a Federal sewage-treatment construction grant program? We are trying to put out a conflagration here with an eyedropper. I cannot urge too strongly, Mr. Chairman, that the items in this bill for sewage-treatment work construction and water-pollution control programs be approved in their entirety.

An item of special importance, Mr. Chairman, is the need for research. This appropriation bill will enable us to make a start in obtaining knowledge which is needed to enable State and Federal Governments to plan and maintain control of wastes in water. Only new knowledge can enable us to conserve, cleanse and reuse waters in the shortage areas. Only new methods can enable us to reduce the costs of waste treatment to reasonable levels.

On this last point, for example, it has been estimated that continued expansion of municipal waste treatment at present per capita cost figures, would not reduce the alarming pollution of our streams at all. With present methods and prices, per capita expenditures for municipal waste treatment would have to be increased by 86 percent, to reach the desired level of control in 10 years.

When you get into industrial wastes, with the discharges from plants producing our wonder chemicals, our thousands of tons of paper and our new metals, the cost and control problems grow even greater than those of municipal sewage.

The plain fact is we must have new knowledge—sure knowledge of the effects of wastes on the usefulness of water, and ways to cut the costs of their control. There is no other way to assure the supplies of water that are needed, now and for the future.

Under the original Pollution Control Act the enforcement provision was unworkable. For that reason enforcement items were disallowed in previous appropriation bills because, in the words of the Appropriations Committee, "the act, Public Law 845, 80th Congress, is in the final analysis almost unenforceable."

Now, however, under Public Law 660, for the first time we have a workable enforcement provision which already has produced results.

Under the new workable enforcement provisions of the act, dockets on 110 actual and potential interstate pollution problems are being prepared with State cooperation. The purpose of this evaluation is to identify those areas in which control may not be adequate and where remedial measures are needed. Priorities will be established on problems not yet solved by the States and research, technical, and other assistance to the States will be provided on the basis of such priorities.

Under the revitalized act, a hearing was held concerning interstate pollution of the Corney drainage system from oil wells in Arkansas making waters in Louisiana unfit for sport and commercial fishing, recreation, stock watering, irrigation, and other agricultural uses, for municipal use, most industrial uses and use by valuable species of wild animals inhabiting the area. Field information reveals that of the 75 oil wells cited in this case, 59 have already ceased contributing to the pollution and the operators of the other 16 wells are taking positive action to cease pollution.

Further, the State of Delaware in its annual report has announced that the interstate pollution of Buntings Branch creating serious nuisance conditions at Bishopville, Md., has been corrected. The Delaware Water Pollution Control Authority announced that a poultry process plant—the major cause of this pollution—has installed an adequate waste treatment system. This action was taken by the State of Delaware after a survey made by the Public Health Service. The State of Delaware requested an opportunity to remedy this situation under its own procedures; so the Public Health Service did not institute formal enforcement proceedings.

These examples illustrate the type of action the Public Health Service will take. Interstate waters, such as the Potomac River and the Missouri River, seem to have critical pollution problems which need to be corrected. If these and other of the 110 areas being evaluated by the Public Health Service are considered to have a high priority for Federal enforcement action, it is expected that formal legal proceedings to abate pollution will be started. In such cases, investigations will have to be undertaken to provide evidence that can withstand legal scrutiny. This will involve the use of trailer laboratories, the procuring of affidavits and other evidence of damages.

In 1957 an excellent start was made in the interstate pollution abatement program on a modest budget of \$250,000. As the program develops with increasing emphasis on conferences, hearings, and technical investigations of pollution in enforcement operations the results will more than justify the appropriation. It is believed the \$350,000 requested is modest indeed to achieve such important results.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 60 years bills have been before this Congress to provide for an effective pollution control program. For the first time we have one. However, this program is just getting started and it needs cold hard cash to be successful. The Nation's future growth depends upon the preservation of the quality of its water resources. We cannot afford to be tightfisted with our Nation's future. I cannot urge too strongly, Mr. Chairman, that this appropriation be approved in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, and I would urge that when the Members return to their offices they get out the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13, 1956, and read the debate which occurred in the floor of the House on that day when the new Federal Water Pollution Control Act was up for discussion. At that time every argument that has been made today was carefully considered, and this House rejected those arguments that water and water pollution were not matters of national concern and were not matters that should be taken care of at once, and by an overwhelming vote passed the House and was signed by the President on July 9, 1956.

In that bill, which was handled on the floor by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and our colleague from Michigan who retired, Mr. Dondero, this House said that Congress in recognition of a national problem authorized the expenditure of \$500 million at the rate of \$50 million a year for the next 10 years in an effort to accomplish something toward combating a menace which has been growing in the United States for over 50 years.

Is pollution gaining on us? It is. For construction of sewage treatment works alone, our yearly average from 1915 to 1950 in terms of 1950 dollars, was \$141 million. In spite of these large outlays, construction has steadily fallen behind needs.

This was especially true during World War II—the very time when a considerable increase in waste production took place. As a result, a large backlog of urgently needed construction has accumulated.

As we stand now, to bring treatment-works construction up to the level necessary, simply to keep even with the growing pollution problems would call for an estimated annual spending of from four hundred and fifty to five hundred million dollars for the next 10 years.

How many treatment plants are we short?

As reported at the beginning of 1955 the figures were:

Municipal treatment plants needed, 6,686. The figure includes: 3,618 new plants; 738 replacements; 1,567 enlargements, additions, and so forth; and 763 of a type not reported.

Industrial treatment plants needed, 5,728, the figure including: 2,508 new plants; 183 replacements; 943 enlargements, additions, and so forth; 644 connections to municipal sewers; and 1,450 to meet a type of need not determined.

Such is the size of the backlog. And stepped-up construction of waste-treatment works is only one of the needs to be met if we are going to catch up with pollution, crack the problem of regional shortages, and safeguard a growing nation's diminishing water supply.

Today about 100 million of our 170 million people are living in sewered municipalities. Into their watercourses their municipal sewer systems are pouring their toilet flushings, bath and wash water, kitchen-sink garbage, restaurant and laundry washings, hospital and mor-

tuary refuse—in fact the whole gamut of things mentionable and unmentionable that can be got rid of by dumping them down the drainpipe.

Recent figures released by the United States Public Health Service show the construction grants program under the new Federal Water Pollution Control Act really rolling. The act was signed by the President last July 9. It was designed to help the cities and towns of our country to build sewage-treatment plants. By March 26 of this year \$21,061,879 had been awarded in grants to 255 municipalities to help them in the construction of sewage-treatment works. The cities and towns, ranging in population from 280 to 353,000 had added \$68,871,689 of their own funds, bringing the total to be spent on sewage-treatment facilities to \$89,933,569.

The construction-grants program is only one of several authorizations of the new Federal legislation designed to broaden and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948.

With programs in the course of development in the various areas designated by Congress, the provision for Federal grants to assist in the construction of sewage-treatment works marks the first time in the history of water resources management in the United States that a program of Federal grants to municipalities, designed exclusively to stimulate the construction of sewage-treatment works, has been authorized by Congress.

Construction of municipal and industrial waste-treatment works is far from keeping pace with the Nation's growing pollution problem, according to estimates of needs as made by the Public Health Service. In spite of large outlays, the installation of treatment works has been steadily falling behind needs. As a result, a large backlog has piled up. As we stand today, using 1955 figures as a basis of estimate, the needs as seen by the Public Health Service is for at least 6,700 municipal and 5,750 industrial waste-treatment plants, the figures including new plants, replacements, enlargements, additions, and so forth.

The record so far, as the construction grant program under the new Water Pollution Control Act has been gathering way since its launching late last summer, indicates that it is functioning as Congress intended—as a stimulus to construction of badly needed sewage-treatment works.

It is imperative that we continue this national effort to clean up our country's rivers and streams.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 also contained provisions with regard to grants to States.

A total of \$2 million in Federal grants by the Public Health Service has enabled States to budget \$6,417,356 to help them administer expanded State water pollution control programs during the current fiscal year.

Despite shortage of scientists and technicians, the first response to the general-aid program is encouraging.

Reports on the program from the States indicate that the Federal money is being spent by the State to obtain better water quality data, determine the

degree of antipollution treatment needed, and where necessary, to prosecute water pollution control violations on intrastate streams.

Some of the State agencies are spending a part of their funds for automatic sewage and industrial waste sampling equipment. Several plan to purchase special equipment to monitor radioactivity in waters; 10 States are planning special radiological surveys.

Nearly all of the reporting States plan to expand existing laboratory facilities. Four plan decentralized branch offices. Eight expressed the desire to modify existing water pollution control laws in the direction of stronger enforcement.

This Federal aid is given under section 5 (a) of the new Water Pollution Control Act. It is in addition to the act's authorization of \$50 million annually—up to an aggregate of \$500 million—to help communities build sewage treatment facilities.

In this kind of a program the States have the basic responsibility and the Federal Government shares in the financial burden of helping to provide much needed assistance in this new and important program of cleaning up the Nation's rivers and streams.

Broader and more intensive research is an urgent need in fighting the pollution of our streams and rivers. Establishment by the Public Health Service of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, at Cincinnati, Ohio, marked an important step to meet this need, but more money than has so far been made available is needed to provide research there and elsewhere.

Some of the studies being carried on at the Robert A. Taft Engineering Center are:

Significance of viruses in water supplies.

Role of fungi in water sanitation and in waste treatment.

Improvement of methods for rapid identification of bacterial indicators of sewage contamination.

Identification and control of algae, actinomycetes, and other water-supply interference organisms.

Determination of the environmental requirements of fish as a basis for establishing water quality requirements.

Determination of the persistence characteristics of organic compounds in water solution.

Development of procedures for routine stream monitoring for radioactivity.

Evaluation of water-treatment plants in removing heavy loadings of coliform organisms in raw water.

Treatment requirements of individually owned and operated water-supply systems.

The funds sought for research in water-pollution-control program is modest enough, in all conscience. Study of the pollution of our streams and rivers by the new petrochemical and other industries demands the best scientific and technical skills and techniques. To get them more money is needed than is being sought here today.

If there is any other item in the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies

appropriation bill of 1958 which more vitally affects the life, health, and general welfare of the 170 million people now living in this country, and our obligation to provide those who come after us with an adequate supply of pure water, I do not know what it is.

I urge, therefore, that this amendment be overwhelmingly defeated and that the House of Representatives again reiterate what we said so forcibly on June 13, 1956.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. I want to commend the gentleman for the illuminating and up-to-date figures he has given showing that there has been a great spurt of activity on the part of municipalities and State legislatures most of which are now in session considering this legislation greater than ever before.

In addition to the moneys which the localities put in for the sewage-disposal facilities there then comes also additional expense in terms of sewers and for collecting systems and for all these other facilities that do not come under a sewage-disposal facility. So the ratio, instead of being 1 to 3 or 1 to 5, I believe, will hit 1 to 8.

I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Every 4 years, the two major political parties gather in convention to select candidates, make promises, and write platforms. Last year, the Democrats met at Chicago and the Republicans at San Francisco. Both parties had something to say on water pollution and water resources. The Democrats and Republicans recognized that water is one of our most valuable natural resources, one that we must protect and conserve.

The Democrats at the Chicago convention adopted this language as a part of their platform:

The Democratic 84th Congress has taken a long step toward reducing the pollution of our rivers and streams. We pledge continuation and expansion of this program, vital to every citizen.

The Republicans at San Francisco went a little further than the Democrats. Of course, they held their convention a little later. The Republicans had this to say:

Water resource development legislation enacted under the Eisenhower administration already has ushered in one of the greatest water resource development programs this Nation has ever seen, a soundly conceived construction program that will continue throughout this century and beyond.

Those platforms were adopted in 1956 and the act has not yet been in effect for a year.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Would the gentleman take that statement to mean an endorsement of section 6 of this Water Pollution Act?

Mr. KARSTEN. As I see it, the Republicans want to take credit for the benefits but they want to place the blame

for passing it on the Democrats. Of course, the Democrats are willing to assume that responsibility.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was chairman of the Democratic platform committee and that was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee which drafted the Democratic platform and by the full committee. I may also say it is amusing to me to listen to the arguments of those who favor the elimination of this \$50 million from this appropriation bill on the basis that water pollution legislation is something of recent origin. This Congress has been considering it as far back as I can remember being a Member of this Congress. In the early thirties a great man in Connecticut, Gus Loneragan, who served in this body and in the Senate, was fighting for water pollution legislation in an effort to awaken the people of the country to the necessity of it. This is a meritorious item, one that is vitally necessary, and I join with those who opposed the amendment and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. KARSTEN. The Republicans are committed for the remainder of the current century and the people would like to have some action.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of my Republican colleagues to this fact: I think the President in his state of the Union message made the most forceful statement on water and natural resources that has ever been stated by anybody. May I just quote this:

I would like to make special mention of programs for making the best uses of water, rapidly becoming our most precious natural resources, just as it can be, when neglected, a destroyer of both life and wealth.

He goes on to recommend programs of cooperation between the Federal, the States, and local authorities to prepare a technique whereby we can clean up these polluted waterways all over the country.

Mr. KARSTEN. That language is practically identical with the remainder of the language in the Republican platform. Evidently the President is making a genuine effort to try to carry out the platform, but he needs a little help from the Republican side of the aisle in order to do it.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Much has been made of the point here that this is a congressional program that was not endorsed by the administration. Is there anything in the Constitution that prohibits the Congress itself from enacting a program that is beneficial to the people of the country?

Mr. KARSTEN. I know of nothing in the Constitution to that effect.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Did not the President sign this bill?

Mr. KARSTEN. Yes. The President could have vetoed it. The Republicans took every possible bit of credit for it in the last year's elections.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I listened to the gentleman from Pennsylvania quoting the President, he talked about water resources, which is a very broad subject, and would include your Colorado River project, and others. I do not think anything was said about pollution.

Mr. KARSTEN. I might say to the gentleman from Missouri that the language in the Republican platform is so broad it encompasses everything in the way of water resources. Certainly pollution of our streams is seriously damaging our water resources which the President spoke of in his message. These are the same water resources that the Republicans seek to protect in their platform. The people have the right to expect the Republicans to carry out their programs.

The Democrats also have a responsibility because the program was inaugurated during the Democratic 84th Congress. We, too, have pledged continuation and expansion of the program. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

(Mr. KARSTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this debate has gotten far afield from some of the reasons why we should seriously oppose the present amendment to strike this amount of money from the budget. The other day I came across the word "metropolis" in a newspaper. I wondered what it meant and found out they were talking about huge cities that are rapidly taking form in this country. These new areas extending on the eastern coast from Washington to Boston present new problems in pollution. As a matter of fact, the most serious problem they have to contend with is pollution. On the west coast the great area, for instance, in southern California has the problem of air pollution and sewage and water pollution to take care of. It is the thing that hampers the growth of these areas.

In this week's U. S. News & World Report they sketch the stripped cities that become the metropolises of this country throughout the future. They tell you of the decentralization of people, the decentralization of industry along the new projected highways, and in parts of the country where these highways have been built we have seen this decentralization, and with that decentralization comes the problem of pollution.

Pollution is the enemy of modern civilization, and I am sure that those of you who have traveled in Europe or the Orient are immediately struck by the difference in the cities that you see and the approaches to the cities that you see. But particularly in the Orient and Africa your nose knows the difference when you get into the cities where pollution is rife with accompanying diseases and the disorders that follow that sort of thing.

Now, there is no time to wait. We are behind in this program. Trying to rationalize the situation, our friends who support this amendment tell us that we can wait; we can put this off until another day; we can wait for the pie in the sky. But, there is no time to wait. The problem is here now, and we have been delaying and delinquent in trying to find its solution. I am certain that when this House rejected the amendment to strike this from the bill last year by a vote of 165 to 213, it spoke the will of this body, and the will of the other body, apparently, evidenced itself or the bill would never have become law.

So, let us not haggle about how this became law. It became law because there was a demand and a necessity for it for the health of this country and its orderly development.

I remember just yesterday taking a look at a page in the Washington Post that speaks of 30 years of pollution, and I think that anyone who reads that or those of you who read and remember recognize why this problem must be solved now if we are to develop our country and its resources to the fullness that will be necessary to meet the populations to come in the years ahead.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 115, noes 55.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

(Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a measure to repeal the Colorado River storage project. I take this action now because the Bureau of Reclamation has called for bids on the construction of the dam at Glen Canyon. These bids are supposed to be opened this month and there are specifications

in the request for bids which violate the terms of the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and the water and power contracts thereunder.

Item 5 of paragraph 52 on page 43 of the printed specifications provide:

During closure operations the contractor will be required to pass a minimum of 1,000 cubic feet per second through the right tunnel intake closure structure until sufficient head is available to pass 1,000 cubic feet per second through the high-pressure slide gates of the left diversion tunnel with all gates fully open. As soon as 1,000 cubic feet per second is flowing through the left diversion tunnel, the contractor shall make closure of the right diversion tunnel. The flow of 1,000 cubic feet per second through the left diversion tunnel shall be increased to 3,000 cubic feet per second and then maintained at 3,000 cubic feet per second until the reservoir water surface is at elevation 3,400. When the reservoir water surface is at elevation 3,400, the high-pressure slide gates shall be closed and minimum downstream requirements shall be met by passing water through the river outlets. The discharge through the river outlet shall at all times thereafter be as directed by the contracting officer.

The Colorado River Board is concerned with the procedure specified in the foregoing in regard to the effect thereof on the water supply available to the Lower basin and on the power output at Hoover Dam especially, and also at Davis and Parker Dams. Releases on the order of 1,000 to 3,000 second feet over a considerable period of time would result in a very substantial curtailment in water supply at Hoover Dam and possible reduction in power output capability at Hoover and other powerplants.

This means that there would be a withholding of 3 million acre-feet of water during the first phase of construction. The water at Lake Mead behind the Hoover Dam is already at a dangerously low point resulting in inefficient operation of the generating plants. The amount of water to be released under the proposed construction contract is far less than the contractual requirements below the Hoover Dam. In fact, it takes over 2,000 second-feet to supply the Mexican Water Treaty and it takes an additional 1,500 second-feet to supply the metropolitan water district of southern California. It takes a thousand second-feet to take care of the evaporation on Lake Mead. It takes 4,000 second-feet to fulfill the contract with the State of Arizona and over 5,000 second-feet to supply the All-American Canal in Imperial and Coachella Valleys. This totals more than 12,500 second-feet which must be released from the Hoover Dam and with a controlled inflow ranging from one to three thousand second-feet would develop a disastrous overdraft on Lake Mead and threaten the valid contracts for power developed at the Hoover Dam.

I am amazed to find that the Secretary of the Interior and the General Counsel for the Bureau of Reclamation were unaware of the provisions of the proposed contract even though the opening of the bids is but a few days away. The inclusion of item 5, paragraph 52, into the

contract presents serious legal questions as section 7 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act requires that the Secretary of the Interior exercise his authority granted in section 7, as follows:

He shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and any contract lawfully entered into under said compacts and acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

Section 14 of the same act directs compliance with the compact and statutes and the Mexican Water Treaty, and authorizes suits to enforce such compliance. So, here we have a proposed contract which invites litigation immediately.

During the hearings on the Colorado River storage project considerable testimony was recorded challenging the sufficiency of the foundation upon which the dam was to be built and yet the design of the dam indicates that it is about half as thick at the base as is the Hoover Dam, which is founded upon a much sounder base even though both dams are the same height.

Apparently the Reclamation Bureau became alarmed at the sufficiency of their specifications and appointed a commission of independent engineers to pass upon them, but not before they had been submitted for bids. If their report is adverse, new specifications will have to be drawn and new bids secured at an undue expense to the bidding contractors.

The project is not feasible in that its repayment schedule is based on the sale of power at 6 mills, while at the same time it is indicated that thermoelectric plants can be built nearer the load center using the great deposits of coal in that area to generate power at 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour.

The repayment schedule was based on an estimated cost of \$760 million. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates the cost at \$933 million and under the 1956 cost indexes it would indicate that the authorized units in the bill will cost over \$1 billion.

At this point I call your attention to the fact that the Trinity River project which was estimated by the Bureau at a cost of \$225 million will exceed that cost by eighty or ninety million dollars. In fact, it is hard to find any project that has not run from 30 to 50 percent higher than the estimated costs.

Congress and the Nation are demanding substantial cuts in the budget. There is a current budget request of \$25 million to start construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. Contracts have already been let for nearly \$9 million for access highways and the Glen Canyon Bridge. These items would not be wholly lost by the deauthorization of the project as most of it is for highways and a bridge. Now is the time to stop this unnecessary project until full justification can be made for it.

Two months before the passage of the Colorado River storage project there were

enough votes in Congress opposed to its passage to defeat it by as large a majority as was given its final passage. The White House secretaries spent several weeks lobbying among the Republican Members. On the day of the debate the President devoted a great portion of his news conference to the importance of this measure and at the same press conference announced his willingness to run for reelection. I am certain that this announcement alone caused at least 50 Members who expected to run on the record of the administration to fall into line with the President's request.

After its final passage, I listened to many Members who voted for the project explaining that it was one of the worst votes they had ever made in Congress, but what else could they do under the circumstances.

I urge my colleagues to give this project a new look and to reconsider the enactment of this infeasible, unnecessary, and costly legislation.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution which will be referred to the Rules Committee which calls upon the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6127, a bill to protect the civil rights of our citizens. The resolution also provides for 2 days of debate on H. R. 6127, equally divided, and makes provision for such amendments as Members may wish to propose. This is not a discharge petition. Under the rules of the House, this resolution must remain in the Rules Committee 7 days before the procedure to discharge the resolution can be initiated. It is my earnest hope that there will be no unwarranted delay by the Committee on Rules in reporting a rule on H. R. 6127 so that this vitally needed legislation can come before the House at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, both parties are on record that the protection of civil rights requires legislative action on the part of the Congress. To do less would constitute a lack of faith not only toward those of our citizens who are today being denied their just rights, but will also do us great harm in the eyes of the whole world. Therefore, I trust that all committee action will be concluded shortly. Should an unusual situation arise, however, I am ready to place into motion the machinery to discharge the Rules Committee from consideration of the bill.

H. R. 6127 is a good beginning to right the wrongs under which many of our fellow citizens are suffering. This bill enacts a national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. This would be implemented by the establishment of a six-man Commission on Civil Rights with a full-time staff director appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, which would gather information

and make reports. It provides for a larger staff in the Attorney General's office headed by an Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. Most importantly, H. R. 6127 authorizes the Attorney General to institute civil proceedings to obtain injunctive relief in cases involving the right to vote. The Attorney General can also file civil suits against persons who attempt to harm a citizen's right to vote.

It is an unfortunate fact that in some localities the enforcement of law and order has broken down and individuals have been intimidated for exercising their rights. The constitutional guarantees of equal protection under the law clearly place upon the Federal Government a duty to act when local authorities fail to protect constitutional rights.

Because of my own lifelong efforts in support of equal opportunity for all races and creeds, I intend to take every step to insure congressional action to guarantee all of the rights of all our citizens. As long as discrimination exists in this country, we shall be morally vulnerable in the fight against world communism and aggressive dictatorships abroad. We cannot assume the leadership of the free world if we remain tainted by inequality in our own land.

Federal courts must be granted clear jurisdiction over civil-rights violations and our Federal law-enforcement agencies must be strengthened in order to establish a proper framework for the eradication of these injustices. H. R. 6127, while not as comprehensive a civil-rights act as the one which I introduced earlier in this session, is a good step in that direction. It cannot be allowed to be pigeonholed in the Rules Committee. I intend to take every action for prompt consideration by the whole House so that every Member can stand up and be counted in this crucial fight.

SUPPORT PRICE ON CORN DURING CROP YEAR OF 1957

(Mr. COAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, on the 21st day of March I sent a petition to the Secretary of Agriculture asking that corn raised during the crop year of 1957 be supported at \$1.60 per bushel for those farmers who comply with acreage allotments.

The petition which was sent the Secretary was signed by myself and 30 of my colleagues. This was a serious and honest effort to get the Secretary to do that which he can do as set out by the authority of already existing law.

However, to this date I have not even received so much as an acknowledgment of the receipt of the petition let alone any indication whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture intends to do anything about raising the support price on corn.

I trust that this is not to be taken as an indication of the true feeling which the Secretary may hold for this segment of agriculture. However, through recent press reports it seems that the Secretary is now not even interested in get-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 4, 1957
For actions of April 3, 1957
85th-1st, No. 58

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....2,23	Forestry.....3,10	Property.....21
Budget.....2,14	Information.....11	Reclamation.....4
Conservation.....18	Insect control.....5	Small business.....17
Corn program.....6	Labor, farm.....14	Statehood.....16
Cotton.....15	Lands.....20	Statistics.....12
Crop insurance.....22	Livestock.....19	Trade, foreign.....1,24
Disaster relief.....18	Marketing.....19	Transportation.....9
Farm program.....8	Natural resources.....16	Water pollution.....1
Feed grain.....8	Plant pests.....5	Wildlife.....10
Foreign aid.....7	Postal rates.....13	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee ordered reported bills for financial aid to desert-land entrymen, and for deferred grazing and protein feed program for drought areas. Rep. Ullman introduced and discussed bills to provide emergency loans to certain orchardists and to include reestablishment of orchards under conservation programs. House received President's message recommending U. S. membership in OTC. House debated Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the President a message recommending legislation to authorize U.S. membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (H. Doc. 146); to Ways and Means Committee. pp. 4464-5
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Completed general debate on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 4465-4500). Agreed, 162 to 140, to an amendment by Rep. Fisher to strike out \$50,000,000 for grants to States for waste treatment works construction under the Water Pollution Control Act (pp. 4465-69).
Rep. McGregor called for a reduction in the budget, and expressed pleasure over receiving many letters urging reductions. pp. 4463-64
Rep. McCormack criticized the President for not responding to the House resolution requesting him to advise the Congress where reductions could be made in the budget. p. 4507
3. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 469, to authorize the U. S. to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision, and to defer such termination for a period of 18 months. pp. D284-5

4. RECLAMATION. Rep. Dawson, Utah, criticized efforts to halt construction of the Colo. River storage project. pp. 4501-02

5. INSECT CONTROL; PLANT PESTS. The House Committee report on H.R. 3476 includes the following summary of the bill:

"This bill has two related but distinct purposes. Title I establishes for the first time specific authority for the Department of Agriculture to regulate and control the importation and the interstate movement of plant diseases and disease-bearing organisms. Title II amends the list of insects and plant pests with respect to which the Department of Agriculture is authorized to conduct eradication and control campaigns. The list is amended by adding four new plant pests (imported fire ants, soybean cyst nematodes, witchweed, and spotted alfalfa aphid) and by giving the Department of Agriculture general authority to conduct campaigns against pests related to those named in the act without specific authorization from Congress."

SENATE

6. CORN PROGRAM. The Senate Committee report on S. 1771 summarizes the bill as follows:

"This bill would--

(1) establish a base acreage of 51 million acres for the 1957 corn crop in lieu of the 1957 acreage allotment of 37,288,889 acres;

(2) require participation in the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program to the extent of an acreage equal to 15 percent of the farm corn base acreage as a condition of 1957 crop corn price support in the commercial area;

(3) raise the 1957 support level for corn outside the commercial area from 75 percent to 82½ percent of the commercial area level (the 1956 level having been 82½ percent);

(4) repeal that part of section 308 (d) (3) of the Agricultural Act of 1956 which would require 1957 corn crop outside the commercial area to be supported at 70 percent of parity if support should be made available to producers in the commercial area not complying with acreage limitations; and

(5) require a study and report on a feed-grain program which can be made effective with the 1958 crop.

"The requirement as to soil bank participation, and the increase in the noncommercial area price-support level, are not specified by the bill; but result, under sections 308 (a) and 308 (d) (2) of the Agricultural Act of 1956, from establishment of a base acreage for corn. The price support level in the commercial area which has been announced at not less than \$1.36 for 1957, would not be affected by the bill."

7. FOREIGN AID. S. Rept. 139, recently issued by the Foreign Relations Committee, includes a number of recommendations for changing the technical assistance program, largely from an administrative standpoint.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

8. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. LeCompte inserted an Iowa farmer's ideas concerning an improved farm program, centered on feed-grain controls. pp. A2665-6

9. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Lane inserted statements by Mass. industrialists opposing percentage-type rail rate increases. pp. A2667-8

10. FORESTRY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor on National Wildlife Week and the importance of wilderness areas in preserving wildlife. pp. A2669-70

culture. With membership in the proposed OTC we will be in the strongest possible position to achieve the full benefits that these agreements afford.

I recommend the early enactment of this proposal.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1957.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Anderson, Mont.	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Dawson, Ill.	Kelley, Pa.
Aspinall	Dies	Norrell
Blitch	Eberharter	Powell
Bowler	Engle	Proaty
Celler	Fallon	Reece, Tenn.
Cretella	Green, Pa.	Thomson, Wyo.
	Gregory	
	Holtzman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 410 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, strike out line 1 through line 4.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I must rise in opposition to this amendment that has been introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. First, I want to commend the subcommittee on the fine work that it has done in the preparation of this bill, and also the fine work that is being done by so many of the Members

who, just as I am, are interested in showing and practicing some economy in our Government. But always there is the recurring and ever-present problem of where we are to economize; how much and where shall we make these cuts.

Now, I wonder if it would not be well to look briefly at this program of water-pollution control and see if this is really a wise area to affect economies. Let us see just how this program works and what it does.

So many of us are apt to think of the program as being just another Federal giveaway; as a program where some officials of the Federal Government decide it would be a nice thing to build a sewage-disposal plant out at Timbuktu or somewhere, and then they go out there and they build a fine new sewage-disposal plant. That is not the program we have under consideration here today.

This program is a participation program in which the Federal Government, after careful scrutiny on the part of local and State authorities, will come in under proper conditions and participate financially up to 30 percent or \$250,000, whichever is less, in effectuating needed water-pollution controls. The appropriation is allocated to the individual States, and the local authorities decide upon the merit of the projects.

Now, what does this amount to? It is simply that the health authorities at State level must approve these projects. The projects under this program must meet certain criteria, an important one of which is the Federal impaction problem caused by our national defense installations in particular areas.

Now, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Indiana yesterday in his very able presentation in support of this amendment say that "This is indeed a meritorious program, but like so many of these programs we are going to have to postpone it to another day, when the burdens of national defense are not so great upon us." I, of course, can appreciate this viewpoint, but I feel that it is not applicable in this particular instance because, first, this program directly affects national defense in many instances; and, secondly, because this program cannot be postponed until another day.

Let me give you a brief example of a situation that happened to exist right in my congressional district. We have one of the largest naval air-training stations in the world located on a peninsula surrounded by Corpus Christi Bay on one side, Laguna Madre on another, and a little shallow backbay called Oso on the other side. Now on the opposite side of the Oso from this great naval station is a sewage-disposal plant called the Oso Bay Sewage Disposal Plant of the city of Corpus Christi. This plant has become overburdened because of the impaction of the area, partly caused by the naval air station. As a result there has been pumped hundreds of thousands of gallons of raw sewage into this Oso Bay, which in part includes the naval air station, causing a great threat to the health of all who lived and worked near by. The Water Pollution Control Act is designed to help eliminate situations like this. The problem is just as simple and serious as this. The solution to this

type of problem cannot wait until tomorrow. When we have a sewage plant and it becomes overburdened, the sewage must go in a raw state into the bay or river into which it drains, and when the sewage mains become overburdened, they simply will not carry any more and the commodes back up. And thus we have a situation that causes an extremely serious health problem not only to civilians, but to the military personnel in the adjacent areas.

It is well enough to talk of putting off a solution to this problem until a future date, but the problem is with us today. It was with us yesterday and it will be with us tomorrow and the days following. This problem cannot be put off until tomorrow, unless this distinguished body feels that it can legislate such a radical alteration of human phenomena that we will no longer have a need for sewage disposal plants. The menacing situation which I have described existing in the area near the Naval Air Station in Corpus Christi is repeated in many other areas throughout the 14th Congressional District of Texas and is directly traceable to the unusual impaction caused by the location of military installations in the area.

It is indeed unreasonable for this Congress or for the Federal Government to expect our cities and our towns to be able to handle the added burden of sewage disposal and other matters that are caused by the presence of our military personnel and their dependents in ever-increasing numbers. The 30-percent Federal participation in the solution of this problem is certainly little enough for the Federal Government to pay as its part of the share of protecting the health and the well-being of the military personnel and the civilians who live in these polluted areas. We have many fine cities in the 14th Congressional District of Texas and many other places in the United States who are indeed proud to have in their community the military personnel of this country, but who, nonetheless are in vital need of the 30-percent Federal assistance in matters of water pollution control in order that they can assure the health of the people in their communities and in their vicinities.

I have in my district the city of New Braunfels, whose application for \$75,000 was approved on March 28. I have within my district the city of Mathis whose application for \$31,500 was approved March 27. I have on application the city of Corpus Christi for \$250,000; the city of Beeville for \$84,300; and the city of Poteet for \$21,150.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of this distinguished body that these good, hard-working people are not asking the Federal Government to come down and build these public facilities for them, but are actually asking the Federal Government merely to participate to the extent of its obligation to the people who are in this area.

Bear in mind that these cities are putting up more than 70 percent of the total cost of these projects, and the Federal Government's participation is not, and cannot under the law, exceed 30 percent. If there ever was an area where the Fed-

eral Government not only has a right, but a direct responsibility to participate in assisting in the protection of the health of the people of a community, it is in those areas where there is intense Federal impaction that makes it impossible for the local interests to carry the burden without assistance.

In conclusion then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the Water Pollution Control Act is one of the most important matters affecting public health that will come before this body; that it has an extremely important and direct defense aspect; and that it is designed to correct problems which exist today, the solution of which cannot be put off to a future day.

I therefore respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that this distinguished body should give careful consideration to this most serious problem confronting the public health of this Nation, and as long as this Government is sending billions of dollars overseas to protect the health and welfare of foreigners on foreign soil, that we do not practice the unwise and foolish economy of depriving our own people at home of this public-health protection. It would indeed be a disgrace for us to strike from the appropriations bill this sum of money which is used for the Federal Government to pay its share of the responsibility to its people, when, at the same time, in the President's budget is contained more than \$4 billion designated to go overseas for the use of the people on foreign shores.

Again, I desire to commend those Members who, like myself, are interested in economizing in our governmental operations, but I would caution that we be wise in our economies, just as we should be wise in our expenditures, and let us do nothing that is going to endanger the public health of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to see if I can find out from the chairman of the subcommittee how many rollcalls he expects to ask for and on which amendments.

Mr. FOGARTY. Up to this time we expect to have eight rollcalls on amendments that have been adopted.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman expect to ask for those rollcalls?

Mr. FOGARTY. Those amendments have already been adopted. The number of additional rollcalls will depend upon the additional amendments that are adopted while we are in the Committee of the Whole. The pending one is an example. If this amendment is adopted, we will have a rollcall on that.

Mr. MORANO. Would the gentleman tell us what the amendments are, what the issues are?

Mr. FOGARTY. The first amendment on which we will have a rollcall would

be the Smith amendment, which cut the amount for the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor.

The second is the Budge amendment which cut the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights Division.

The third would be the Smith amendment cutting the Bureau of Employment Security, Salaries and Expenses, which money does not come out of the Federal Treasury.

The fourth would be the so-called Murray amendment which cut the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The fifth would be the Andersen amendment which cut the Women's Bureau.

The sixth would be the Hébert amendment which cut the Wage and Hour Division.

The seventh would be the so-called Jonas amendment which cut the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration.

The eighth is the so-called Dorn amendment that was adopted on yesterday, cutting salaries for the Office of Education.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman does not intend to ask for a rollcall on the amendment which struck out the \$200,000 for the President's Committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; because of the lack of interest shown yesterday. If anyone else desires to ask for a rollcall, that is perfectly satisfactory to me. I would be glad to help the gentleman get a rollcall on any of them.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Would the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORANO. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, by a strenuous effort yesterday I restrained myself all day long, and I would like to have 5 minutes today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] who offered this amendment. But certainly I think this represents, if approved, the death of a very fine program, one in which the Members of this House were very much interested as recently as some 9 months ago. Yesterday, during the debate, a number of times I thought it would have been appropriate had the Sons of the Pioneers been available here to give us a rendition of the song, Cool, Clear Water, because we heard a lot of talk yesterday about cool, clear water. I think all of us are in agreement that it is the most vital and essential natural resource we possess.

One of the principal reasons for my asking for this time, though, was to clarify the position of some of us in California with reference to the construction of Federal projects. My friend and colleague from California [Mr. SCUDDER] in answer to a question by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] yesterday afternoon seemed to feel that we in California would have been better off had we not had the advantages of a number of those projects. I for one must vigorously disagree with my colleague from California.

At this time I want to express my deep appreciation and my thanks to all the Members of this House who from time to time have supported the construction, the authorization, and the appropriation of moneys for the development of those great projects which we enjoy in California. It has contributed to the development of that great State and has made it possible today for us to pay in an amount of some 10 percent of the total Federal taxes collected in this country. They have paid for themselves tenfold. They are outstanding projects. I and the people I represent in the central part of California, in the San Joaquin Valley and in the Sacramento Valley, up and down that great State, are deeply appreciative of the fact that they were able under Federal legislation to enjoy the benefits we are so proud of there.

Further, I should like to comment with reference to the idea of permitting the purchase by the State of California of those projects. It is my firm conviction that 80 to 90 percent of the people in that State would oppose such a program and certainly it would be my hope that no such proposal would ever come before this House.

In the moment or two that remains to me I should like to call your attention to what I believe to be some reasons for the need for this \$50 million appropriation called for in this appropriation bill. There has been a great shifting of the tax base. The municipalities today are squeezed for a tax base. We have school districts and we have other districts which are taxing the present base. Also, the shift of the tax to the Federal level has squeezed many of our States and the municipal groups to a position where they just no longer have a tax base sufficient to grant them the money necessary to do a lot of this work.

Certainly I am in agreement that if and when the time ever comes that we at the Federal level can adjust our thinking and begin to reduce in substantial measure a lot of these Federal taxes and return to the States and to the municipalities and to the counties some of that tax base, then I think we shall be in a position to do a little better job at the local level than we are doing at present. But as long as the Federal Government is taking such a big bite out of the tax base, it becomes an impossibility for these municipalities to do the jobs they should do.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Member from the Fourth District of Michigan should know something about pollution having lived for many years on the St. Joe River which originates in Michigan and flows down through a part of northwestern Indiana, then back up into Michigan and on into Lake Michigan at St. Joe and Benton Harbor. Also on the Kalamazoo where, if you will look at the October 1953 issue of Life.

The remarks of the chairman remind me of the statement in the Scriptures. This is the seventh day of debate. The Scriptures say that in 6 days the Lord made heaven and earth and all therein but on the seventh day the Lord rested. He evidently found the result of his labor to be good. It is just possible that if we strike the enacting clause of this bill and send it back to committee with recommendations, we may find our 6 days labor better than what we now have before us.

Going back to the Kalamazoo River. It happens that a creek that empties into the Kalamazoo flows through a farm which it is my privilege to own. Down at the mouth of the creek—Dumont Creek, if you look at the October 1953, issue of Life you will see where there is at least an acre and perhaps several acres of dead fish killed by pollution of the river. The city and the State will take care of that situation with any money for sewers. But this bill which is before us here, if I get it correct, is not one about pollution, it is about building sewers and who shall pay the cost thereof—indirectly, of course, it relates to pollution because all sewage tends in that direction. The people along the rivers have a remedy, a legal remedy, and it is adequate if enforced against the people who cause pollution. The people who live along the upper stretches of a river have no more right to pollute that water than I have to go to your home and throw a bucket, let us say, of swill—those who know about feeding pigs years ago, know what swill is—and throw it through the back or even through the front door of your home. So that remedy is available. Another thing. We all recall that the Founding Fathers thought it was a good thing for this to be a Government by the people. To reserve to the people and to the States all the authority not granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government. Here the Congress day after day and year after year, surrender bit by bit, that sovereign power of the people and the State to the Federal Government.

It is surprising and startling when the total result is considered that so many who profess allegiance, their whole allegiance, to the provisions of the Constitution vote away the rights of the State, and ask the Federal Government to do something for them which they or the State should do. As the gentleman who just preceded me said, we heard a lot about pure water yesterday, especially from our Pennsylvania folks. When it was settled, the streams of Pennsylvania were some of the finest in the whole

world—pure and cold water which we know is necessary to good health. How did the rivers get dirty and polluted? Only because the people who live along the banks of the river or use the river are themselves guilty of dirty practices. That seems to be a raw statement, but it is true; is it not? It is just the same as the case of our streets and our parks being dirty because the folks are careless and throw their waste out and walk or drive along or away and leave it there. Or the cause is the greed of industry which dumps its waste into a clean stream. In Michigan, in my hometown, we built our own sewers. We had to issue long-term bonds. But we did it and never have we cried about it. Allegan is a small town with a population of about 5,000. In Grand Rapids, a large city just 40 miles away, they voted a bond issue. They sold the bonds. They had the money. But along came this legislation by the Federal Government. What did they do? They had the money. They put in a disposal plant—and then took the Federal money—and they put their own money back in their pockets. Legislation of this kind tends to make the people surrender their independence and become dependent upon the Federal Government. It makes weaklings of the people. As has been said so many, many times, Uncle Sam does not have a single dollar except as he gets it from the people. I see the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] shaking his head from side to side. But what has just been said is true. What we are doing is to redistribute tax dollars. Taking from those who are paying in the most, giving a part to those States and those communities which pay in less or plead poverty. That is what we are doing here in almost every session. I cannot quite understand why, if we believe the States should retain their power and if we want independence in our local communities, we should not take care of our own sewerage problems, keep our own supply of water pure—if that is what we want, and apparently we do. Why should not we invoke the laws that are already on the books in every State against those who cause our rivers to be polluted?

The only possible answer I can see is that the communities think they do not have the money or are so limited in independence, in thrift, in willingness to earn their own money and spend it their own way—that they want someone else to carry them along—not willing to walk on their own feet.

Now I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman think that the residents of Radford, Va., and Harrisburg, Va., which are large communities and have big industries, have the right to pollute 120 miles of the New River?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course they have not, and there is a remedy for it, of course there is. There is nothing in the record to show they cannot clean up their own rivers. Surely they are not dependent upon, do not want other States to carry their burden. The people of the Virginias are a proud, independent people.

I doubt they want the dollars of Michigan people to pay for the disposal of their waste and garbage.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 10 minutes past 1, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the names of those gentlemen who are standing indicating they wish to speak on the amendment: Messrs. FOGARTY, BYRNES of Wisconsin, DENTON, GAVIN, BAILEY, HESTAND, and DURHAM.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not against the rules of the House for a Member to speak more than once on an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wishes to challenge any Member the Chair will rule at the time the question is raised.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was wondering if the Chair had any responsibility in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on any point of order at the time it is made.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, evidently the gentleman was referring to me. I do not want to cause him any concern. He has been very patient in listening to what I have had to say. My position on this matter is well known. I will withdraw my name if that will make the gentleman a little easier.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think it would aid every Member of this House if he will get a copy of Public Law 660, the Water Pollution and Control Act. He will find that the general objectives and general operations of the Federal Government in the field of stream pollution are covered by that act.

This amendment does not repeal that law, it simply relates to but one section of it, section 6.

We have heard a lot of talk about the need to clean up our streams. With that objective I am in full agreement, but this amendment, Mr. Chairman, does not in and of itself clean up one single stream; there is no control aspect in this particular section 6 of the Water Pollution Act which is affected by this amendment.

From the speeches we have heard, one would think the Federal Government was not doing anything in the field of research, development, promotion, or

control of pollution. The fact is, however, we are, if you will just read at the bottom of page 24 of the appropriation bill that is before us you will find that we are appropriating over \$12,500,000 for these particular purposes.

Mr. Chairman, the provision we are here discussing does not control pollution. Simply stated all it does is to get the Federal Government involved in a purely municipal function.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am sorry, I have just 3 minutes. It does not say that any particular community will get money. Some Members feel that we have made a commitment. Read the public law. We make no commitment to any specific community. We do not say that every community that wants to build a sewer treatment plant or sewage disposal plant shall get money out of this bill. There are conditions and requirements. Even if a community can meet all those conditions and requirements there is no definite promise it will receive any part of this \$50 million. It is interesting to hear the gentleman from California contend that the municipalities are in need. I suppose no community has all the funds it would like, but if they are in need in connection with this matter I suppose they are in need so far as all other municipal facilities are concerned. What justification have we at this time to provide aid for this particular municipal function? If he is going to rest his case on the question of need, I think the gentleman better go and do a little studying on what the financial situation of the Federal Government is and compare that with the situation in the States and the municipalities. He will certainly find that from the standpoint of need, the greatest need is to reduce the expenditures of the Federal Government and provide some relief from Federal taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the retention of this item in the pending appropriation bill is vital to my State of West Virginia where we have spent a tremendous amount of money in correcting pollution coming from the operation of mines. We have legislation preventing the building of any new industrial plants. We are forcing the plants that are there and that have been there for years to comply with our State laws requiring the installation of sewage treatment facilities.

The worst problem we have comes from the unrestricted flow of sewage from municipalities into streams that flow into the State of West Virginia. Let me ask: Why should West Virginia be imposed upon by the sister State of Virginia? They have sewage along the New River, they have cities, they have industrial plants that pollute over a hundred miles of the New River before it ever reaches the State of West Virginia.

You heard a gentleman say that we already have all the law that is necessary. I was in Congress when that river compact legislation was passed. I opposed

it. Little has been accomplished toward taking care of the national pollution of our streams through that law. No better illustration need be given than reference to the Potomac River compact. You have seen the statements in the newspapers that they have not accomplished anything so far as that situation is concerned.

I sincerely hope that the pending amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the last few years we here in the United States have reached the point where water in some sections is one of the most critical items in supply. For the development of our industries, water is a must. We could never have developed our great industrial empire if this country had not inherited, so to speak, a great supply of pure water.

As the population has grown throughout our fast-developing country, the needs have shifted from one section to the other. In some sections there is a lack of supply of water and in others there has been an oversupply. Also, we have built great hydroelectric dams for producing power, thus creating great wealth for the Nation. Federal funds have been expended rather freely in the Northwest and in the Tennessee Valley which have provided for those sections great economic growth and strength. On the east coast, from Maine to Florida, where the population is the densest and where the great industries of the country still remain to a large extent, and where the population has increased so rapidly, a great burden has been placed on our rivers and streams for the transportation of sewage and industrial waste out to the sea. The load has become almost unbearable, resulting in a great loss of pure water. This section must depend on these rivers flowing to the Atlantic for its supply of drinking water and for all other purposes where water is needed. The beaches from Maine to Florida are also being damaged.

All the States today have some body of law on the books against pollution of streams, and industry has been cooperating and trying to meet the required public health standards. But in my own particular section, of which I speak primarily, a small river flows through a highly industrialized section of three of my counties. Some of the communities there are one-mill village communities, several of them unincorporated. This stream supports or carries all the burden from the sewage plants for about 300,000 people or more. This is for a distance of only about 30 miles. The mill people are able to build and to provide equipment to take care of their own problem, but the village people cannot support the type of sewage disposal that is required by the public health standards unless they can secure help from some other source.

Further down this river, people are dependent on it for drinking water. This means not just one community af-

fected, but miles and miles downstream people are deprived of the use of this water for drinking purposes. This is the only river of any size, with any supply of water, which flows throughout this section. It has become a critical situation for us, and I think the same thing applies to many other communities.

The Federal Government has authority over navigable streams. These little communities which have no authority to issue bonds are placed in a very bad position. I have enjoyed this stream as a boy and young man down through the years, but now it is almost impossible for a catfish to live in this river, which is known as Haw River. This is an Indian-name river, as the early settlers discovered who came in around 1720.

I have supported funds for water drought in the Southwest; I have supported funds for water supply for the California desert; and I voted to build dams out of Federal funds to control the Mississippi, the Ohio, and other rivers from flooding people out; and I believe at one time we went so far as to spend Federal funds to dig wells in the West. I can see that this is no different problem; it is just another problem of the same type created by water and the necessary use of it by man.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee votes down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear in our minds just what this amendment does. All this amendment does is take out Government subsidies and grants for sewer installations and waste treatment works. That is all. It does not affect the purity of the water of our country. It does not even affect the curing of industrial wastes; not a bit. It just simply grants to the communities this money for waste treatment, for works construction.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to say that I heartily endorse what the gentleman has said, because this morning again on two different occasions I made a check, and there is nothing to this story, in which some believe, that it has anything to do with water pollution. Those funds are still available. Water pollution will have its fair share of consideration. They will be cooperating with the States, but this has nothing to do with water pollution, which many in this House feel it does.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman. It is important to realize that we have a \$50 million possibility of saving funds. The grassroots is calling for savings. Here is a chance to do it. Many of you will be questioned, What did you do when it came to cutting the budget? Well, it may be truthfully said that some tried to cut, and probably you might claim some of the amendments were claimed to be penny wise and pound foolish, but here is a chance where you can tell your constituents you voted to make real savings.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment carries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that this amendment is defeated. The House decided very clearly a year ago that they wanted this law put into effect. This amendment simply repeals the law that you passed last year.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to say to my friend from Illinois, when he talks about it having nothing to do with pollution, Do you mean to tell me when you build a sewage-disposal plant that it is not affecting pollution emptying into the streams? The pollution is now going into the rivers and streams. This legislation will encourage the people to build these sewage-disposal plants to eliminate the sewage being pumped into the streams. Certainly it has everything to do with stream pollution and clean waters. We have for years been polluting our streams. All this refuse and debris is going into the rivers, but when we build a sewage-disposal plant it no longer goes into the rivers and it clears up waters. So do not say that this legislation has nothing to do with water pollution, because it does.

Mr. DENTON. I just want to say in conclusion that we have a bill offered by the gentleman from California that would provide Government assistance in preventing air pollution. Why cannot we have a bill aimed at water pollution of our streams?

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, that water is one of our most important natural resources, I have long maintained. I agree that maintaining quality is just as important as providing quantity. That we have a water-pollution problem stands uncontroverted.

The question is, Do we solve that problem by providing Federal aid at the rate of \$50 million per year for 10 years?

This appropriation cannot be justified on the basis of the inability of the local governments to finance the construction themselves. There is no showing that a single community cannot handle its own. Therefore, under the guiding principle that in what the States and local governments can do for themselves, the Federal Government ought not to interfere. This is not justified.

Recognizing this, the proponents argue that this is required to provide the incentive to cause the local governments to meet the problem. As I recall the debate last year, the committee contended that an immediate investment of \$7 billion was required to meet the present problem. Increased usage of water will almost double that figure in the next 10 years, the period of the authorization, as shown by the Hoover Commission figures on water usage and, as I recall, found by the legislative committee.

Our first year's experience, according to the committee hearings and this de-

bate, indicates that the Federal Government under the formula supplies about 22 percent of the total cost. This would require a Federal contribution of \$1,400 million to provide the Federal share of the construction needed now and that much more to meet future requirements over the next 10 years. That would call for an annual appropriation of \$280 million per year for the next 10 years. This program and this appropriation calls for \$50 million per year. Such a program will aggravate the problem, not solve it. We are saying to municipalities, sewer districts, and the States, Wait for a Federal grant, rather than saying to them, This is an urgent problem, face it, do it now. Other features of the Water Pollution Act are well conceived and, given a chance, in my opinion, will help to really solve the problem. For these reasons I voted for the motion to recommend last year and for passage of the bill. For the same reasons I urge that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, so many Members have just said what I was going to say. My very good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], mentioned the fact that you and I or most of us voted for this legislation 1 year ago in June of last year by a majority of some 50 votes. This House passed the legislation that you are asking us to repeal now.

Now, some Members of Congress find fault with the Committee on Appropriations for bringing in legislation on appropriation bills. That is something that I cannot justify and I never have. But you who are supporting this amendment are doing exactly that thing today; you are doing it in reverse. You are offering an amendment to strike out this entire amount of \$50 million, and you are in effect repealing legislation that you voted for and that the President of the United States signed into law last July.

Someone said that the administration is not for this. Well, this item is in the budget. The budget that we have before us is the administration budget. It came from the White House. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. It must have had the approval of the President of the United States, or it would not be before us at this time. And, when my friend from California makes the statement, and the gentleman from Illinois who is on his feet now states that the construction of these plants has nothing to do with the cleaning up of the polluted waters of this country, they are just as wrong as wrong can be. The principal thing that this program does is to stimulate the communities in building these sewage-disposal plants. As a result, when these sewage-disposal plants are in operation, it makes the streams clearer; it cleans up the waters. And beyond that there is the benefit that goes to the communities downstream even more than it does to the communities which are building these particular sewage plants.

Now, another statement was made about redtape here yesterday by the author of this amendment. This law was not passed until July 9 of last year. We have had only 9 months of operation up to this time. Nine hundred and ten applications have been received from every State in the Union and from each of the congressional districts that you and I represent. Two hundred and eighty-eight of those applications have already been processed. Twenty-five million dollars has been approved. And if we approve all the 910 applications it will mean \$88 million, which is \$38 million more than we have authorized under this law. If we vote for this amendment we will be making one of the saddest mistakes we have made on this appropriation bill because this is something that is going to help every individual in our country.

Those who appeared before our committee in support of this appropriation were representatives of the Isaak Walton League, the Federation of Sewage and Industrial Waste Associations, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, and so forth. Every one of these organizations is 100 percent behind this bill. I think it should be enacted into law and not repealed as this amendment will do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FISHER and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 162, noes 140.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise, report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken, and that the bill be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that it be reported back to the House within 5 days with amendments which will indicate the places and amounts in the budget where the committee believes, in view of the statements made in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, that substantial reductions may best be made and will meet the views of the House with the least curtailment of efficient administration by the Departments affected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the interest of saving time, I am perfectly willing that the point of order should be ruled on now. Why wait 5 minutes or 10 minutes if it is out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order? The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, as I remember the reading of the motion, there is matter of wording contained therein that is not permissible under the rules governing procedure in Committee of the Whole, but would be allowed under the rules of procedure in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to point out that there is a precedent for the motion and the rules cite a precedent where that motion has been held to be proper in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not familiar with that precedent, but the rules of the House provide that certain language contained in the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan could be entertained in Committee of the Whole, but the balance of the motion would only be appropriate in the House. For that reason, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the motion that was offered is based upon a precedent found in Cannon's Procedures, page 103, note 6, and Hind's Precedents, page 117, section 2329, where Mr. Currier, chairman, said:

The gentleman may move that the Committee rise and report this bill to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A motion to recommit is in order in the House. It is in order in Committee of the Whole House to move that when the Committee rises it recommends to the House a recommitment of the bill.

However, as a safeguard this second motion to rise and report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken is now offered. If the motion to strike the enacting clause is adopted by the Committee, the Committee will go back into the House and the same motion which the Chair has just ruled out of order in Committee will be in order in the House but it cannot there be offered until the disposal of any rollcall that has been demanded on any amendment has been had. One of the President's first and most enthusiastic supporters under date of March 31 printed an editorial in the Detroit, Mich., Free Press, the Chicago Daily News, and the Miami, Fla., and Akron, Ohio, papers and there wrote:

I had hoped this week to get off the President's back. There is no satisfaction in disagreeing with a man for whom you have tremendous respect and affection.

But when Ike derided attempts to cut his overstuffed budget as fatuous and foolish economy, it seemed that a few more words should be said on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, the editorial will later be read. But this is the point. This is the seventh day of debate on this bill. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr.

H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] announced there would be rollcalls on at least eight amendments.

Mr. FOGARTY. There will be a rollcall on one more amendment now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That makes nine. Now, how many more rollcalls will be asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] I do not know. It is very evident from the way the debate has gone on in Committee that we will be here at least another day on the rollcall votes.

Here we are now with the budget that the President sent up to us, cut by the Committee on Appropriations and then by this committee. After the budget was sent to us it is my understanding the President said that cuts could be made; that if desirable we should make them. Then the House, in its wisdom, or lack of it, sent that budget back to the President with suggestions that he tell us where the cuts could be made with the least harm.

The President very properly sent it back to us saying it was our business to make cuts where we thought they should be made.

The committee has made its suggestions as to where and in what amounts the reductions should be made.

The gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. FOGARTY], throughout the debate—perhaps it may be said every day on every amendment—has charged that we are just walking up the hill only to walk down again. It was also said that by making certain reductions we were endangering the health and lives of our people. An appeal to passion and prejudice.

This motion to recommit which will be offered in the House if adopted does this: Instead of sending the bill back to the President we send it back to the Committee on Appropriations for reconsideration, which is just exactly what the majority did when it was sent back to the President. Why should not the committee take another look, come back with what the committee, having in mind the desire of the Members, has to suggest—not just the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]—oh, no, not his suggestions alone, but those of the full committee meeting again and having in mind the fact that practically everyone, including the President, by inference at least, says the budget should be cut.

Why not come back with what might be termed a clean bill, perhaps the result of compromise, certainly the result of more adequate, careful, comprehensive consideration. Then perhaps we could agree on what should be done in the interests of economy which is what the people want—what we say we want.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Just to pinpoint what the gentleman has said in view of the fact so many Members have suggested that the President should tell us where cuts in the budget should be made I want to call attention to the statement the gentleman from New York [Mr.

TABER] put in the RECORD yesterday coming from Secretary Folsom:

Some of these programs, of course, were enacted last year without our specific recommendations and some of them went in over our objections. For example, on the water-pollution waste-treatment projects, we did not recommend an appropriation authorization to Congress and that is a \$50 million item.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman but I cannot yield further. The only purpose of asking that the bill be sent back to the committee is that we may have a better bill, a bill on which those who advocate economy can reach agreement; make the more sensible cuts do the least harm to each phase of the program.

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—IKE FORSAKES CONVICTIONS FOR THE PERILOUSLY UNSOUND

(By John S. Knight)

I had hoped this week to get off the President's back. There's no satisfaction in disagreeing with a man for whom you have tremendous respect and affection, particularly if he happens to be the President of the United States.

Better to tell how the incredible Dave Beck lived it up with union funds, or discuss Bold Ruler's chances against Calumet's triple entry in the Kentucky Derby.

But when Ike derided attempts to cut his overstuffed budget as fatuous and foolish economy, it seemed that a few more words should be said on the subject.

The President made three points at last Wednesday's press conference:

1. Piecemeal cuts of \$25 million here, \$50 million there and \$150 million anywhere are "meaningless * * * just kidding yourselves."

2. That "significant cuts" could come only from security items such as defense and foreign aid.

3. That Congress, while talking about economy had voted "a great number of public works * * * without proper engineering studies to back them up," so the action "must be for political purposes."

In the first place, I was surprised and disappointed to have the President speak of budget cuts ranging from \$25 million to \$150 million as foolish, piecemeal economy.

And to brand such efforts by Congress as imbecilic.

This is the same President Eisenhower who vowed four 4 ago to exercise a prudent control over Government expenses.

When the Chief Executive now shows no interest in eliminating items that run into hundreds of millions, we should all be worried.

WHAT ABOUT WASTE IN THE MILITARY?

The President's second point is that cuts in defense and foreign economic assistance can be made only at a risk to our security.

Here again, many informed people will disagree.

Our defenses must not be reduced, but there is a lot of waste in the Military Establishment as everybody knows.

And why should foreign aid be stepped up an additional \$500 million?

When the Marshall plan began, President Truman said: "I guarantee to you that we'll not spend it for more than 4 years—15 billions of dollars."

HARRY F. BYRD, the consistent Senator from Virginia, says his investigation of foreign aid in Europe disclosed that we have given Denmark \$100 million to pay on their public debt.

So we just added that much to our national debt.

Great Britain was presented with \$200 million to reduce taxes.

Ours didn't go down.

PUBLIC'S LOUD CRY REACHES CONGRESS

The President is right when he maintains that Congress plays politics with public money.

But Congress is hearing from the people, and if the people make enough noise, Congress pays attention.

That was shown Wednesday when the House of Representatives made a \$442 million piecemeal reduction in the \$2.8 billion appropriation the administration had asked for the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Eisenhower administration is insisting that the Government must provide aid to the States in the field of education.

In demanding this aid, it is disregarding its own Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which reported that: "We have not been able to find a State which cannot afford to make more money available to its schools or is unable to support an adequate school program."

The educators quite naturally will welcome this help. It will give them the buildings, schoolrooms, auditoriums, and gymnasiums they think they need.

As Raymond Moley says: "Asking a professional educator if he needs a new building is like asking Johnny if he wants a new bicycle."

Certainly, many of these things are desirable, but are they absolutely essential when the Federal debt is at its statutory limit?

EISENHOWER SCRAPS CAUTION ON GRANTS

The new budget contains 14 new Federal grants-to-States programs, bringing the total to 67.

The President used to say that the Federal Government should not do those things for the States which they are able to do for themselves.

This sound doctrine, like the prudent expenditure of the people's money, has long since been scrapped.

Here is an example, taken from Senator BYRD's recent address to the Senate:

There is in the budget an item entitled: "Salaries and expenses, President's Committee on Education Beyond High School, Department of Health, Education and Welfare." It is shown as an "old" program.

The committee was given a 1957 appropriation of \$150,000 to make a report by December 31, 1957. The original appropriation provided no funds for grants or subsidies.

The pending budget proposes an additional 1957 supplemental sum of \$650,000 in the current year for grants and subsidies. Then it goes further and proposes one 1958 appropriation of \$300,000 to enable the committee to complete its report, and another \$2,500,000 "further to assist in developing programs * * * to implement recommendations of the committee."

Here we have, says Senator BYRD, a \$150,000 appropriation for a committee report, which in two years, grows to a \$3 million appropriation for a grants-and-subsidy program—before the report is made.

This is a small example of how these programs grow.

FIND BUDGET FILLED WITH BOONDOGGLES

Edwin A. Lahey and David Kraslow of our Washington bureau read the 1,249 pages of the new budget submitted by the administration.

They found it to be loaded with frills and boondoggles. Is this good government?

We have 2,389,792 Federal employees. The new budget proposes to add 40,000 more.

In addition, we have 273,674 civilian employees in foreign countries, 26,000 in France, 98,000 in Germany, and 129,000 in Japan.

There are 37,817,000 citizens receiving direct checks from the Federal Government every month. Including their dependents, claims Senator BYRD, it is possible that the

majority of the population get checks from Washington.

And the number will rise under the Eisenhower philosophy that "these are the services which people demand, and in my opinion deserve."

IKE'S PRESENT DEAL TO TOP THEM ALL

The Senator from Virginia, says that he has survived the New Deal, the Fair Deal and the Present Deal. He says with regret that the Present Deal will land somewhere midway between the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

I would respectfully disagree with that conclusion.

In my opinion, the Present Deal will go far beyond anything ever contemplated by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

This is not what the majority of the American people voted for in the elections of 1952 and 1956.

Prior to Franklin D. Roosevelt, our Government followed a pay-as-you-go philosophy. Andrew Jackson, one of the patron saints of the Democratic Party, boasted that he had paid off the public debt in full.

We practiced frugality and thrift in the first 150 years of our Republic, laying the foundations for our future prosperity.

Today, we are endangering the fiscal integrity of our country by reckless spending both at home and abroad.

It is tragic indeed that a man like Eisenhower, a self-proclaimed economic conservative, has forsaken his earlier convictions for a philosophy of government that is unsound and fraught with peril.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the gentleman from Michigan is getting so concerned over these rollcall votes that are coming up. I thought that he would be happy to stand up and be counted when the roll was called. If you want to avoid it, one way is to adopt the motion the gentleman has just offered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was the gentleman asking me if I would stand up and be counted?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not say that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What did you say?

Mr. FOGARTY. I said that if you were interested in standing up and being counted when these rollcalls are asked for you would not have offered such a motion as you just offered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not believe that, does he?

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, you are just avoiding the issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You think I am ducking and running out? I am just giving the gentleman a chance, and you have them on your side. I am just giving them a chance to send this bill back to committee, having the committee make reductions in the light of what has happened that will not hurt the bill. We do not want to hurt anyone.

Mr. FOGARTY. But the motion that you have just made is in effect ducking the votes if this committee adopts your method.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Ducking nothing.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is all there is to it. If not, when we get back into the House why does not the gentleman of-

fer a motion to recommit with certain instructions as to where he thinks the committee ought to make specific changes and report the bill back? There might be some logic to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would be glad to do that if I were so conceited as to think I had the wisdom and enlightenment to cut wisely. I just cannot. I am trusting the gentleman's committee to come in and do the best it can. As to the nine amendments the gentleman wants a roll on, I am willing personally to vote on every one of them, but I thought perhaps after consideration again having in mind the votes in the House that we could make some headway by this method.

Mr. FOGARTY. The best way I know of doing it is to give the gentleman and the other Members a chance to answer these rollcalls.

Now, as far as giving this bill some consideration is concerned, may I say that we have really worked hard and long on this particular appropriation bill. The committee worked for about 6 or 7 weeks on it. We went into our hearings at 10 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 every day and then from 1:30 until nearly 5 o'clock. This in addition to our regular congressional activities. That is a long day. We listened to 180 witnesses and we took nearly 2,000 pages of testimony. I would like to point out that there was not one word of evidence in all our exhaustive committee hearings that you have before you today that will justify any cut you have voted for up to this time. On the last amendment you just voted for, we had the advice of four civic organizations representing millions of people in our country who are interested in clean water systems all over the country. They took the time to come from all sections of the country to appeal to this committee to give and to allow the amount authorized by the President of the United States. That is exactly what we have done.

After we completed our hearings, we then went through the requests, item by item by item, and cut where we thought we could intelligently cut. I think we did a pretty good job because this bill deals with human beings, with the bodies and minds of people now living or who are yet unborn in this country. If you honestly believe in a bill that affects the lives of American citizens, their life expectancy, and the life expectancy of those who are not yet born, a bill that makes this country a better place to live in and a healthier place to live in, then I cannot understand how you can support the efforts being made to cut it as it has been cut. I just cannot understand the logic behind the amendments that you have offered so far in this bill.

I would like to refer to some rather outstanding people in our Nation and to their opinions on this portion of President Eisenhower's budget that we have been discussing for over a week and which most of the Members on the gentleman's side want to reduce still further than the committee has already reduced it. First, many of you will remember the

press release issued by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on February 14, regarding the 1958 budget. To refresh everyone's mind I will place that press release in the RECORD. It is as follows:

STATEMENT BY MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The President's budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare represents a sound, constructive, and prudent approach to problems in this field.

It is not too large in itself, in the light of national needs in these areas. Nor is it too large in proportion to the size of the total budget, or the national ability to support these programs.

Expenditures recommended by the President for this Department in fiscal 1958 amount to \$2.8 billion, or about 4 percent of the budget total.

These proposed programs are investments in human resources—in the health of the American people, in their education and training for living in an increasingly complex world, in their protection against economic want. These are the resources upon which, ultimately, our continuing prosperity and our national security depend.

Neglect of health, education, or economic security will prove very costly in the long run. For problems in these fields, unless resolved, will be compounded by the passage of time. Related problems develop, and the ultimate cost of solutions becomes far greater.

It is important to bear in mind that 64 percent of the Department's budget, or \$1.8 billion, would be required for public assistance grants to the needy, aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children.

We are most anxious to develop constructive programs which will reduce human need in the future. Such programs have received increased emphasis in the 1958 budget.

Most of the recommended increase for the Department would go to help eliminate a critical shortage of classrooms in financially needy communities across the country. I know of no better investment the country could make than to remove a serious deficiency in facilities for education which, if permitted to continue, could only serve to retard our national progress.

The other increases are relatively small in terms of dollars but I believe they will yield important long-range benefits.

Increases of \$7.3 million for vocational rehabilitation, for example, will help restore more handicapped persons to productive employment and will return, in both humanitarian and economic rewards, far more than the cost. A requested investment of \$2.1 million for research in the causes of dependency, and ways of overcoming them, should help reduce the human and economic toll of dependency in our society. Similarly, we are proposing \$2.5 million to assist in training more professional workers to help solve the complex human problems involved in dependency. We are asking for an increase of \$1.3 million for research to help solve long-standing problems which have handicapped education for many years.

The proposed record level of medical research expenditures offers bright promise for reducing the tragic toll of disease and disability among the American people. The proposed aid in building medical teaching facilities and other increases for health programs are also important in accomplishing this objective. We are requesting \$3 million to help States and communities attack the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. A proposed increase of \$2.5 million will help assure safety to consumers in the use of foods and drugs which are rapidly increasing in both volume and complexity.

These are sound, practical investments which, over many years ahead, will yield far

more than their cost in preventing human need, fostering economic growth, and strengthening national security.

The administration is proposing these advances in health, education, and economic security within the framework of a balanced overall budget. The budget, in fact, provides for a surplus for the third successive year. This is no small achievement at a time when circumstances beyond our control compel very large defense expenditures.

If we are to be realistic in our approach, we should consider expenditures for health, education, and welfare and for certain other programs not only in terms of total dollar amounts but also in relation to our population and our whole economy. It is only natural that some budget figures should tend to increase as the population grows rapidly and the economy expands to record peaks.

By 1958, it is estimated the national income will have increased 57 percent over 1950. The recommended 1958 nondefense Federal expenditures amount to an increase of only 14 percent over 1950. The recommended level of nondefense spending would be 4.3 percent of the estimated national income, approximately the same proportion as for the previous 2 years. This is down substantially from the ratio of 7.2 percent in 1940 and 5.9 percent in 1950. Thus, in relation to our means, the 1958 budget for non-defense needs is less than it has been in the past.

The proposed total Federal spending for 1958 would be 19 percent of estimated national income, compared with 22.7 percent in 1954, the first full fiscal year of this administration.

The administration's continuing goal with respect to the budget is clear. It is to restrain Federal spending and cut taxes when this can be done consistent with the national interest. The President and his budget advisers, I know, were guided by a deep sense of fiscal prudence in carefully developing the 1958 budget recommendations in the light of our needs for national protection and for continuing progress in domestic affairs.

Then I would like to read some excerpts from an article entitled "Trends in State Government—1957 as Indicated by the Governor's Message" in the March 1957 issue of State Government the official publication of the Council of State Governments. This article states:

Dealing with States services, the governors called for expansion and advance, above all, in education, in highway construction, and in highway safety. But emphasis was strong in other areas as well—mental health, problems of the aging, and management of natural resources prominent among them.

* * * But behind most of the governors' proposals lay such realities as rapid growth of the population; the relative increase of the younger and older segments of the population; the soaring enrollments in schools; the shortages of trained teachers and school buildings; the record traffic on an inadequate highway network; and the Federal program, with its State matching provisions, for bringing the network up to date.

* * * As one of the governors summarized, most of the problems that confront his State are "products of our growing population and our expanding economy."

* * * "If grass were growing in our streets," he said, "and if smoke were not pouring from the stacks of our factories, we would not have to face * * * the problems of progress."

¹Nondefense expenditures include all functions except those listed in the budget as "major national security," "veterans services and benefits," and "interest."

So you can see our Governors seem to be concerned about keeping up with our growing population, expanding economy, and problems in the fields dealt with in this bill, and certainly do not appear to want us to start going backward.

There have also been many, many comments in very respectable newspapers that I could include in the RECORD to support my contention that those who seek to cut the bill still further, or seek to recommit it to the committee for further cuts, do not represent the feeling of many highly respected Americans and, in my opinion, the majority of the American people. I shall not burden the RECORD with all of those newspaper articles that have come to my attention but I will include three of them in the RECORD, the first two from the New York Times of March 29 and April 3 and the third from the Washington Post of April 3. These articles are as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1957]

IN THE NATION—SWIM, BUT DON'T GO NEAR THE WATER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 28.—It is the "poorest kind of economy," said the President, defending his \$72 billion budget yesterday, "to say you [Congress] are going to save a few millions here and a few millions there." Maybe so, replied Representative TABER, of New York, "but when you don't have any other kind of economizing available, you have to take what you can get."

This was a pretty good riposte in the circumstances because, in further comment on the budget, the President stoutly opposed large reductions on the basis of an orderly formula. This, he said, would cripple continuing programs for which Congress itself had made the Government responsible, and the new programs (schoolroom construction, for example) which he had proposed because he considered them essential to the popular need and the duty of the Federal Government to provide.

By that statement the President took direct issue with Senator BYRD, of Virginia, as well as Representative TABER among the congressional leaders who differ with him about the potentialities of cutting the budget. BYRD contends that an orderly economizing formula is also available to Congress and can be followed without damage to the popular need or the national security. The difference between the President's attitude and the Virginia Senator's has been expressed by the latter in several statements on and off the Senate floor.

"INDEFENSIBLE INCREASES"

"Proposals [by the President] establishing new functions, expanding old ones, and for indefensible increases in current authorizations," BYRD told the Senate, "requested in the Federal budget for fiscal 1958 * * * will force continuing increases in future budgets." And he specified:

"I am convinced that requested appropriations can be reduced by \$6.5 billion: national security, \$1.5 billion; foreign aid and international affairs, \$2 billion; domestic-civilian activities, \$3 billion * * * reducing the budget to \$66.8 billion."

Of the continuing and new programs for civilian-domestic activities, which the President yesterday classified as either imposed by Congress or by the popular need, the Senator said:

"These appropriations are up 36 percent since 1954. The budget contains 37 proposals for new and expanded activities, with 1958 requests totaling \$2 billion. These include 14 new Federal grants to State pro-

grams, bringing the total to 67, and among these is the Federal school construction program with a first year appropriation of \$451 million. Among the hundreds of old current accounts the budget proposes increases in 3 out of every 4. * * * Yet the domestic-civilian programs, even after the cut [of \$3 billion urged by BYRD], exclusive of high ways, will have \$23.8 billion in new authorizations, plus \$24 billion in unexpended balances in prior appropriations, for a total of nearly \$48 billion."

The Eisenhower budget for fiscal 1958, the Senator said to his colleagues, "is a complete reversal of the retrenchment policy to which this administration pledged itself." After reducing the last Truman budget by \$10 billion and cutting spending another \$3 billion for fiscal 1955, the President's budgets "have been rising steadily, with huge increases in the domestic-civilian area. This is the worst yet. It begins another spending spree which will continue inflation and raise the cost of living. And let us not forget that the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury * * * denounced this budget presented by his own administration as authorizing expenditures which, if continued, would lead to a depression that would 'curl your hair.'"

HUMPHREY'S PLIGHT

That reference was to the unhappy situation of a man in the middle, George M. Humphrey, who obviously would like to take a public stand much closer to BYRD's position. But to do that, especially after what the President said yesterday, Humphrey would be in open conflict with his chief, to whom he is intensely loyal. And since Humphrey has made plain his belief that in the national interest the President's leadership should be maintained at its highest possible degree, the Secretary's resignation—which this open conflict would impose on a man of such high principle—would undoubtedly be a heavy blow to that leadership.

Another point of difference between the President and BYRD is that the Senator does not agree that the budget and its expanded social-economic programs are responsive to public opinion. The total tax collections by all forms of American Government is now \$110 billion annually out of an annual income of \$325 billion. And the growing public protest against the ever-rising Federal budget has much of its source in the level of taxation, as Congress is acutely aware.

The President's remarks yesterday complete the anomaly of his position and deepen Humphrey's plight. Both urged Congress to cut the budget. Yet the President now contends it cannot be done either substantially or piecemeal.

[From the New York Times of April 3, 1957]
BUDGET CUTS QUESTIONED—DECLINE IN WELFARE OUTLAYS NOTED, WITH BURDEN ON LOCALITIES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Is the budget too large? First, let me admit that on the basis of the experience of the last few years actual expenditures will exceed budgeted ones (estimates of January 1957 for fiscal year 1958) by a few billion dollars. Second, let me agree also that the budget is not in as sound shape as the administration suggests.

For example, in 2 years roadbuilding in the budget is cut from \$783 million to \$43 million. But \$1.7 billion of outlays has now been taken out of the budget and tucked away in a trust fund. But even with all that I am not worried about the size of the budget.

First, the size of the budget should be put against the size of the economy. In the last 4 years the budget has fallen from 20 percent of the gross national product (GNP) to 16 percent of the GNP, or a relative decline of 20 percent. In the last 10 years the size of the national debt has declined by about one-half in relation to the GNP.

Second, the more germane criticism is that the Eisenhower administration has gone in too much for economy and not enough for needed Government services.

VIEWED AGAINST ECONOMY

Welfare outlays have dropped in a period (1952 to 1956) when gross national product rose by \$65 billion and military outlays were cut by \$10 billion or more and reductions of taxes, costing about \$9 billion a year today, were made.

Even as our peril grew and our international position deteriorated, the Eisenhower administration increased the danger to our trillion-dollar economy and our security generally by serious cuts in our military budget and by a reduction of foreign economic aid of one-half as compared with the last Truman administration and two-thirds vis-a-vis the GNP. Some estimates of cuts are much higher. At least there is now a disposition to reconsider the economy program for national security. For this we are grateful.

The budget upsets Secretary Humphrey especially because of promises made but not kept. The rise of \$3 billion (\$4.7 billion on a cash basis) in 1 year haunts the administration because, with the cash budget up by \$23 billion above the 1952 Taft-Eisenhower commitment, they are embarrassed. They even had asked for cuts in the 1952 campaign of \$40 billion, \$25 billion, and \$10 billion.

But let us note even the \$72-billion 1958 budget is more than 20 percent less in relation to GNP than the 1953 Truman budget, which was under examination in the 1952 campaign. I say this is too great a cut, considering our peril, our shortage of several hundred thousand schoolrooms, our slums, the inadequacies of our social-security program, the unavailability of comprehensive health insurance, etc.

In the welfare area housing costs in the new budget are down and outlays on labor and welfare (health, education, and public assistance especially) up by \$506 million.

WELFARE PROGRAMS

Surely this is no New Deal program when allowance is made for the slashes in 1952-56 and the rise of prices and income. At the very most, the rise in welfare programs in the budget cost about 5 percent of the average annual rise of GNP expected over the next 10 years. Is this excessive, especially in view of the history of 1952-56?

Those who are vexed by the size of the Federal budget would have much more reason to be concerned over the trends of State and local finance. The Federal Government tends to pass its responsibilities on to these governments. For example, new construction by the Federal Government declined from \$4.8 billion in 1952 to \$3.6 billion in 1956, or a drop of 25 percent; and by State and local rose from \$6.1 billion to \$9.8 billion, or a rise of more than 60 percent. Hence, the latter became twice as important relative to Federal outlays in 4 years.

Total expenditures of State and local governments are up from \$12 billion in 1946 to \$28 billion in 1952 and \$40 billion in 1956. On trends of recent years, State and local governments will be spending \$60 billion in 10 years. Is it fair for the Federal Government to tap the richest sources of revenues and put increased responsibilities on State and local governments?

In short, the size of the budget is not so serious as it seems to many, even if allowance is made for peculiar accounting. The administration is to be criticized rather for promises not kept, for dubious accounting, for unwarranted slashes of security and welfare outlays, and for putting excessive burdens on State and local governments.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., March 29, 1957.

[From the Washington Post of April 3, 1957]
IKE DEFENDS BUDGET, ASKS BUSINESSMEN TO ALERT PUBLIC TO FEDERAL AID NEEDS

President Eisenhower threw his full weight behind his \$71.8 billion Federal budget again yesterday.

He challenged 300 business leaders to educate Americans to the need for Federal aid to domestic, school, welfare, and health programs.

In the foreign field, the President said the overriding objective to achieve peace is far more important than a tax cut.

"Much as we hate taxes, it (world peace) is an objective that overrides our aversion to high taxes," he told the 13th Washington conference of the Advertising Council, a non-profit organization which marshals the forces of advertising for public-service campaigns.

The President's remarks were in line with his press conference promise last week to defend his spending requests against current attacks in Congress.

He spoke as the House debated cuts in his health, education, and welfare money bill, the fifth to reach the floor. So far, economy-minded Congressmen have lopped \$800 million from Eisenhower requests of \$13.8 billion.

"I am struck so often by the simplest functions of government that are misunderstood," the President said. "For example, the school program. * * *

"We have a situation today throughout the country of schools running two sessions a day, with teachers overburdened—often teachers having to be employed who are not really qualified. The school situation is suffering very, very badly for lack of facilities."

He stressed Federal aid was essential to inspire the States to improve education, absolutely necessary to the continuation of vital democracy.

"The Federal Government might well help on a one-time basis to get these schools built, to catch up and get out," Mr. Eisenhower said.

The Chief Executive acknowledged that "many people have thought the Federal Government should not take any part in the welfare funds in our country—old age security, unemployment insurance, and health processes."

But to the President such Federal help equalizes services in the several States.

"We would have migrations in this country, with dislocations in industry and in labor force, merely because in one State people would say we can get better help when misfortune, old age, or something of that kind strikes by moving to such a State," he warned.

Afterwards, conferees heard news commentators Roscoe Drummond, Marquis Childs, Edward R. Murrow, and James B. Reston on a panel presided over by Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post, at a Mayflower Hotel luncheon.

Drummond said the character of the Republican Presidential ticket in the next election hinged on the outcome of the fight over the President's budget.

Cutting it is the touchstone of the faith of right-wing Republicans, Drummond commented, and preserving the budget, the hope of Eisenhower Republicans.

Childs characterized efforts to unify Europe as enormously hopeful despite three handicaps: Foot-dragging in England, a strong sentiment to go it alone in the Rhineland, and an insistence of France to bring North African colonies into the alliance.

Reston sketched problems of leaders today in regearing their training and thinking to meet new enormous, even terrifying responsibilities of this age.

Murrow warned against overestimating the reasonableness of Israelites and underesti-

mating Egypt's Nasser, "the calmest, coolest, gambling man I have ever met."

In addition to all this top-level opinion I have received hundreds of letters, telegrams, telephone calls, and personal visits from the people at the ground level who are meeting these problems every day and who, in my opinion, are in the best position to know what these proposed cuts really mean to the American people. It is hard for me to keep from really burdening the RECORD in this instance because I would like all Members to see what has been pouring in to me from these folks. However, I will include just three telegrams that I especially wish to call attention to. These are as follows:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., March 28, 1957.
Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

To help meet critical nurse shortage and insure adequate health care for our people additional graduate nurses must be prepared for teaching and administrative positions which essential and expanding health programs demand. Because of your own and our deep concern and responsibility in this vital situation members of the Rhode Island State Nurses Association urge your support for increased appropriations for public health and graduate-nurse traineeships and extension of practical nurse programs provided for by Public Law 911.

MARTHA O. SAYLES,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 27, 1957.
Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Disabled American Veterans is greatly concerned regarding proposal in House of Representatives to reduce appropriations recommended by your committee for the Veterans' Employment Service of the Department of Labor. Further reduction will seriously impair the service, in placement of disabled veterans into employment. Respectfully urge you to strongly support your recommendation.

OMER W. CLARK,
Director of Legislation, Disabled
American Veterans.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 28, 1957.
Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars disturbed over tentative House reductions in appropriations for Veterans' Employment Service, Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights and Bureau of Employment Security. Strongly urge your support of the amount recommended by Appropriations Committee for these three agencies. Efforts should be made to bring these appropriation items up for rollcall vote to maintain recommendations made by Appropriations Committee.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
VFW National Legislative Director.

I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments under parts C and G, title VI, of the act, as amended, \$121,200,000, of which \$99,000,000 shall be for payments for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,200,000 shall be for the purposes author-

ized in section 636 of the act, and \$21,000,000 shall be for payments for facilities pursuant to part G, as follows: \$6,500,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$4,000,000 for rehabilitation facilities, and \$4,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided*, That allotments under such parts C and G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT: Page 25, line 6, after "as amended", strike out "\$121,200,000" and insert "\$100,000,000"; line 7, after "which", strike out "\$99,000,000" and insert "\$77,800,000"; line 20, after the words "as amended", strike out "\$1,450,000" and substitute "\$1,381,000."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks that have been made on the floor during the last 7 days of debate and the arguments advanced against the cutting of these sums and amounts, I am now able to offer an amendment which meets the objections of both sides and I am sure can well be supported because it does not destroy any program; it does not reduce any salaries; it does not reduce or increase any personnel.

As a matter of fact, it will be noted in this amendment that I do not touch at all the \$6,500,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$4 million for rehabilitation facilities, and \$4 million for nursing homes.

What I do propose is to reduce at the top of the heap some \$21 million for hospital construction, popularly known as the Hill-Burton Act. There is no finer program in existence than the Hill-Burton program. It is a magnificent program; it is one that should be continued and a program which should be given all the money it can use. But the testimony of the budget officer of the Department indicates that in 1956 the fiscal year was ended with an unobligated balance of \$79 million.

In 1957 the unobligated balance was some \$91 million and it is estimated by that same budget officer in testimony before the committee on page 587, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], that the anticipated unobligated funds at the end of fiscal 1958 will be \$86 million.

Now, I do not think it takes an intellectual giant but just a common, ordinary garden variety individual like myself to ask the question, and properly so, What does an agency want to ask \$121 million for when it admits that at the end of fiscal 1958, for which it is asking this sum, there will be an unobligated amount of some \$86 million? I think I have been very generous in only striking some 20 percent and then allowing everything else in the program to remain, of course, with the exception of the expansion of the administration of the program at the top, which would not be needed if they had that much less money. I see no objection to it, and I hope that the House in its wisdom will understand that this is merely a demonstration of drawing in the belt, as I sug-

gested in my opening remarks the other day, of tightening up a little bit and not harming this program one iota.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wonder if the gentleman knows whether, in computing the number of hospitals to be built under the Hill-Burton Act, any consideration has been given to the staffing of those hospitals. What relationship does the building program have to the shortage of personnel?

Mr. HÉBERT. I have found no indication of what the shortage of personnel has to do with the construction of the hospital itself. I am talking about the stone and the mortar.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; but if we have stone and mortar, we want to put the patients in the hospitals and have them cared for.

Mr. HÉBERT. I suggest to the gentle lady that I am allowing the sum to remain for the nursing homes, and next year, after they are graduated and trained, they may be sufficiently trained to increase that amount.

Mrs. BOLTON. But, there is no relationship established between the plans for building and the plans for more nurses.

Mr. HÉBERT. There is no relationship as far as I know, because this is on a State formula and, in effect, you just cannot spend all the money now to do it.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman have in mind how this sum compares with what they had in the last fiscal year?

Mr. HÉBERT. It was less than this amount. I do not recall the exact amount, and I am unable to find it immediately. Perhaps the gentleman can aid me.

Mr. BURLESON. But this is a greater sum than the same service had appropriated last year?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. This is in addition, and that is what I am pointing out, and I think it is very important, that we are not cutting down any of their services. We are taking off \$21 million and applying it only to the construction program.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PELLY. I did not understand that the Clerk had read beyond line 17. May I inquire if this amendment includes the figure on line 20?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment that the gentleman from Louisiana offered was addressed to the language beginning on line 5 but does touch on a sum included in the next paragraph beginning on line 18.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which would apply to line 17. If this amendment were

acted on, would that prevent my amendment from being offered at the end of the paragraph which begins on line 5 and ends on line 17?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman applies to that portion between line 5 and line 17?

Mr. PELL. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order, because the Clerk has not read the next 3 lines, 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was my understanding that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana went down to and included the language at the end of line 20 on page 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment does go down that far, but the Clerk has not read those last three lines.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that further amendments cannot be offered to the language before line 20 on page 25, because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] takes in 3 places in the bill and goes down to and including the paragraph "Salaries and expenses" where his amendment offers to cut the amount in line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement the gentleman makes is correct, but the fact remains no point of order was made when the amendment was read.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make is that there were no objections raised when the amendment was offered and considered down through line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The portion of the gentleman's amendment having to do with those three lines, lines 18, 19, and 20, can have no effect until those lines are read and then considered.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is the gentleman's amendment in order when he has, in one amendment, sought to cut three places in the bill, from lines 5 to 20?

The CHAIRMAN. No point of order was raised against it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought that would be a concession that those lines had been read, the lines down to and including line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. It is no concession until such time as that portion of the bill is read.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if no objection were made, would that preclude the consideration of my amendment which begins on line 17, following the action on the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say at the outset, as has been said by other Members, that I am just as interested in economy in government as anyone, as my better judgment will allow.

We have been considering this bill for several days. I want to commend and

applaud the committee in charge of this appropriation bill; as well as the patience and indulgence of the membership of this House, including the leadership, for taking the time in discussing so thoroughly these matters of so much importance to the people of America.

In my experience, Mr. Chairman, this is I believe the first time, recently anyway, that the House has taken time thoroughly to debate and discuss these matters of so much importance to the American people.

I am not one of those, however, who believe that the way to economize is to deliberately use the meat ax. We have a program here under consideration that has been in effect since 1945. It is generally known as the Hill-Burton Act.

Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the leadership of the late beloved Percy Priest, working with Jim Dolliver, of Iowa, who was in this House for a long time, reported the first bill of this kind, which later became the Hill-Burton program.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, during these 12 years there has been no program that has been received with more popular acclaim, that has provided for a greater need, that has contributed more to the health and welfare of our people, than this program for hospitals. It was a sad record that we had revealing insufficient hospital facilities throughout this great Nation of ours to give some relief to human suffering.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. No; not just now, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just want to subscribe to what the gentleman is saying and agree with him.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman subscribes and agrees, yet he reduces the program by about \$21 million. That would reduce the long-range program established by a survey in every State in the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT. If the gentleman can tell me where one single hospital will not be built, then I should agree with him that this amendment should not be offered. Name just one hospital.

Mr. HARRIS. I can cite the gentleman hospitals in his own State that will not be built.

Mr. HÉBERT. Name one.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit me, I will cite the record.

Since this program was established with the first appropriation in the fiscal year 1948, the great State of Louisiana, ably represented by him and other distinguished Members of this House, has had a total allocation of over \$24 million. More than \$23 million of Federal funds have been expended in his State for this program. More than 10,000 beds of a general hospital program have been realized from this program. There are many projects pending. Applications before the Department are pending to meet the needs of general hospital beds. Of your own State, 3,444 are needed.

This is from a survey made by his own State organization. To reduce this appropriation by some 20 percent would reduce the number of projects that could

be approved in the next fiscal year by that amount.

Now, with reference to this so-called or alleged unobligated balance, the appropriation under the authorization for this program is available for obligation for 2 years. It then reverts to the Treasury.

Let me say here, that since this program was inaugurated \$800 million of Federal funds has been provided. Local sponsors of projects throughout the country have in addition provided \$1,600,000,000, a tremendous program. Included with these projects are 37 university medical school hospitals. This is where they turn out doctors to administer to the sick and afflicted.

Back to the so-called unobligated funds. It takes time for a community to initiate a program and to develop it. Now let me explain the practical problem. These programs are developed in four parts: Part 1 is the initial approval; that takes time. Part 2 is the finance plan; that requires more time. Part 3 is the site acquisition. This always requires some time to work out. Part 4 is for the drawing of plans, the architectural work, and it is at this stage when the money is obligated. This always requires 1 to 2 years. Generally, 18 to 20 months.

Now that should explain to anyone the simplicity of the program and that these so-called unexpended balances actually do not exist. This is so because during the course of the year in following the procedure as to the four-part stages, most of the money is in the process of obligation.

To show that this is true beyond any doubt, whatsoever, is that out of the \$800 million of Federal funds for this program, in the last 12 years, only about \$1 million has actually reverted to the Treasury.

Therefore, the so-called unobligated balances which my colleagues have referred to, have apparently been promised to communities. The money has been allocated to the States for this purpose.

Furthermore, make no mistake about this, the law does not permit any funds allocated to one State to be transferred and expended in another State. This was to insure each State that it would have its full allocation under the formula.

Furthermore, there is a total annual authorization of \$150 million a year for this program, but the Congress has established an annual appropriation of around \$90 million and \$100 million for the last several years.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. Just a minute, now. I do not have much time and I cannot get an extension of time.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just want the gentleman to be correct, that is all.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I know something about this program and if I am wrong on any statement I stand corrected, but I get the impression that the gentleman offered his amendment to reduce the appropriation simply for the reason of economizing, without taking into consideration the need for the pro-

gram in the vital interest of sick people.

That is what we are faced with here today. Last year we reduced the appropriation. Again this year we are reducing it.

Every State has a program worked out, and it is worked out under a hospital survey program within the State. The States which operate this program are depending upon the Congress meeting its share so the bond structure can be made effective.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely appeal to my colleagues to vote against this reduction in this vital and essential program. Human suffering is of much greater concern to me than what I believe to be false economy.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point in the bill to make it very clear that although I have supported some of the cuts and will support others I am considering each one on its own merits.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for just one very brief statement?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that there are many sponsors of this program throughout the United States which have voted bond issues? Their local people are for this program. To reduce it as is sought to be done here would further nullify the action by the voters for those projects.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think the gentleman is correct.

In making decisions on the amendment I am basing my judgment on the implications of every amendment. These paragraphs in the bill touch upon matters which have been my deep concern over a long period of years. At the moment we are considering among other things the building of additional hospitals.

Can this be done intelligently when no one seems to have an answer to the problem of how they are to be staffed? We do need hospitals, but we also need the nursing and medical staff for these hospitals and clinics and rehabilitation facilities and nursing homes which are so needed throughout the country.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. I would direct your attention to what I said in my opening statement that none of these facilities are cut at all by this amendment.

I did not want there to be any confusion about that.

Mrs. BOLTON. There is none, I am sure, but I am speaking generally.

Wards in all too many hospitals have been closed because of a lack of nurses to care for patients who should be in those beds. Even whole sections of certain hospitals cannot function because of the lack of personnel. Beginning with line 21, on page 25, which has not yet been read, there is set aside money for various public health needs. Among these are additional funds for traineeships for graduate nurses to prepare

them for teaching posts. The shortage of teachers of nursing has created a very real bottleneck in the process of increasing the number of professional nurses so dramatically needed by our sick.

I am delighted to find there are adequate funds in this bill to continue that program. If you will read the testimony given by Miss Arnstein on page 613, you will see that she says:

As I said, there are signs the situation is improving somewhat. In 1948 there were 32 nurses per 100 patients in our general hospitals. In 1955 there were 36. An increase of 4 per 100 patients. * * *

While the professional nurses—what we call the R. N.—have been increasing slightly, the auxiliaries have been increasing tremendously, so that we had 57 nursing personnel per 100 patients in 1948 and we have 84 nursing personnel per 100 patients in our hospitals in 1955.

But that does not mean that we have an adequate number of trained nurses. Most of the increases in bedside nursing personnel has been in auxiliaries. We need them. We need every one of them, but we also need trained nurses and trained administrators and trained supervisors. The hospitals which are said to have benefited by this increase in personnel are largely the general hospitals, not the hospitals for maternity, tuberculosis, and psychiatry, and so on. While the situation with respect to general hospitals may have improved slightly, and I certainly hope it has, we still very much need an increase of technically trained nurses. Because I know the continuing problems created by nurse shortage, I am in favor of the grants for nurse traineeships, which will help open the bottleneck caused by a dearth of teacher nurses. And because I am in favor of all the hospitals we feel we can build, I am particularly regretful that during the discussions on this bill that concerns itself with the hearts of the people of this country, that has to do with the vital heart of the life of this country, that there has been intruded into it so much partisan politics. It has no place in this bill, Mr. Chairman. We should not permit ourselves to appeal to the baser elements in men and women; we should keep this discussion on a very high plane. Because such intrusions militate very seriously not only against the prestige of the committee, but also against the best interests of the people of this country, I cannot but protest the nature of some of the debate on this bill. We have a heavy responsibility, Mr. Chairman, one to which we should be giving the best that is in us.

The work of this subcommittee is so outstanding that it should have no shadow cast upon it.

[Mr. BASS of Tennessee addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] on her remarks on this amendment. It may be that some of you do not know that she has had long experience in this field, and I think we

would do well to listen to what she has said.

I am no expert on hospitals, but in the past week I have had occasion to visit one several times where my father was a patient. Every time I went through I had to walk around three corridors, thread my way through a narrow passage to get to the end of the corridor where he was lying ill. And why did I have to thread my way? Because the hallways of that hospital had beds end to end, and they were not empty beds, they were beds with patients in them.

If this amendment is going to do anything to slow down the hospital building program now, next year, or the year after, then I say we should proceed very cautiously in doing it. I talked to some of the nurses in that hospital and they said: "We could do a better job for more patients if we had the necessary number of rooms to put them in and could get them out of the hallways where it is almost impossible to give them the kind of treatment that they need."

We defeated an amendment here a little while ago for the treatment of stream pollution. I heard people say yesterday that some cities have built their own treatment plants; why does not everyone do it?

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. The amendment was carried. It was not defeated.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I meant the money was stricken out of the bill. The amendment carried.

Some of these cities do have their own sewage treatment plants. Cincinnati on the Ohio River was mentioned as using the water out of the Ohio into which smaller cities up the river are dumping untreated sewage. I pointed out in a private conversation on the floor that it costs almost as much for a city of 5,000 to build a sewage treatment plant as it does for a city of 100,000. The only difference is, the small city cannot bond its people for the expenditure of that money. I realize it costs more for a larger city, but the basic elements, the architect's plans and all of that are just the same almost regardless of the size of the city. Some of the people in the larger cities are not doing themselves any service when they prohibit the smaller towns and cities from building sewage disposal plants and allowing them to continue to pollute the river.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want to say to the gentleman that if I thought that my amendment would deprive this Nation's sick of one single hospital bed I would not have offered the amendment. I am strictly in accord with the Hill-Burton program. I believe it is a magnificent program. This amendment of mine merely puts in order certain necessary economies.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman, I am sure, is sincere and I hesitate to oppose him, but it seems to me the logic

of his argument boils down to this: The Hill-Burton program is a fine program, let us cut it.

Mr. HÉBERT. Oh, no; I am not cutting the program.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not know how the cutting of \$21 million would affect the program. I am not a mathematician. If the gentleman wants to talk about the garden variety mathematician, I think I can qualify. I know one thing, the cutting of \$21 million out of a construction program is not going to get more hospitals built.

Mr. HÉBERT. They would still have \$86 million of unobligated funds.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Louisiana that this does not cut the amount he sets forth in his amendment, but 3 times that amount because this is a matching fund, one-third by the Federal Government, one-third by the States, and one-third by the local hospitals.

Mr. HÉBERT. These funds have not been matched yet.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I realize that.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If it does not stop the building of any hospital rooms, how is it going to save money?

Mr. HÉBERT. It is going to save the money which we appropriate this year and which is being utilized.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If it is not being spent it would not be saving anything.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone wants to cripple the hospital program, but this problem of unexpended balances carried over year by year is rather silly bookkeeping. Here is a situation where you have \$80 million appropriated for this purpose and unexpended because they have not been able to get enough calls to consume the total. That \$80 million will go on to next year. In connection with the armed services we have I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars of unexpended balances. In foreign aid you have the same situation of hundreds of millions of dollars of unexpended balances. Why do we not use the unexpended balances and help balance the budget for 1958? That is what I cannot understand.

Now, we have had so much sobbing and weeping and wailing about this bill. Every time anybody has undertaken to cut out anything in this bill somebody has gotten up and said, "If you do this thing you will cut the heart out of this bill." I never saw an animal with as many hearts as this bill appears to have, because there has not been a single thing that you cut out of here that you did not take out one heart at least.

Now I think it is about time we got down to business on this bill. We have had everything from holding out the tin cup and taking pennies away from a blind man when somebody wanted to cut out some unnecessary expenditure. Then we have had the hospital thing. They said somebody is going to be deprived of some bed, when they have some \$80 million laying around waiting.

Now, is it not about time for us to dry our tears, wipe away our tears and do what we are supposed to do here, sit down and look at this thing from a commonsense standpoint and stop appropriating unnecessary funds?

For instance, I had a questionnaire this morning sent me by a disgusted Republican from Ohio. It was 4 pages and contained at least 100 questions, which asked the fellow how many cigarettes he smoked a day, whether he smoked cigarettes, did he smoke cigars or a pipe, did he chew tobacco, or did he take snuff. And all through that were questions, how old were you when you started smoking? How old were you when you stopped smoking? How many cigarettes do you smoke a day? Now, that sounds like a little old thing to talk about, but after all, when you add up all the time it took to make those questionnaires out or the time it took to send them out, all the postage it took and all the postage it took to get them back, and then all the time of this billion dollars a month worth of Federal employees it took and whatever use is going to be made of those questionnaires, it adds up to a lot of money.

Now, we have been accused—what was that word the President used the other day when we cut little amounts out of this program—that we were being fatuous. Well, I did not look that up in the dictionary, but I do not think it was meant to be complimentary to the House of Representatives. Now, if we make a broadside cut of 10 percent, as somebody has suggested, then we are using the meat ax, of course; if we try to do it the only way we can, the common sense way, in connection with unobligated appropriations, we are accused of being fatuous. Now, you can pay your money and take your choice, but just let us use a little common sense and not pile up this money in these bureaus and invite them to spend more than they need and more than the country can afford.

If you have tears to shed, save a few of them for the American taxpayer—the forgotten man.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise and speak on this amendment, but I have some knowledge of hospitals and the health of this country, and I have a vital interest in it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I tried to get the gentleman from Virginia to yield, because I have a genuine desire to do what he suggested, and that is to do something about this military budget. But I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia or anybody else thinks that if we offer some amendments to cut the military budget—and remember, that is where two-thirds of this spending is—we will have very little of a chance of getting anybody to walk through the aisles on a teller vote to cut where the real cut can be effected.

I walked out of this building the other day when the temperature was 70, and

there was a Chevrolet car out there, an Army car, with a sergeant sitting in it, with the motor running. And I assumed it was not to keep warm. And I just said to him, "What is the motor running for?" He said, "Well, I want to be ready to go when the general comes." Now, if you have 20 of them sitting around with the motor running, I do not know how many gallons of gas they will burn an hour, but it will amount to a considerable sum at the end of the year. But I wonder if anybody is going to help us cut that budget.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Because my name has been mentioned by my good friend from Ohio, I want to say that when the time comes to cut the military budget, wherever there is a dollar proposed that I think is unnecessary to the defense of this country, I will vote for it, and I will vote for it on any other bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, what I rose to say is this: In my State they have been appropriating money for the last few years to survey a dry canal. They say they are going to improve navigation. They are going to make a canal 200 miles long right alongside a river. They are going to pump the water out of the river in order to make the canal navigable. And it is going to cost this Government and local interests in the neighborhood of \$200 million before they are through with it. I am going to oppose that. When the time comes to vote on that bill—and you vote it up every time; you gave them \$250,000 the year before last and \$150,000 last year—I am just wondering how many of you will vote to cut that out. And if you will, it will help to balance the budget so that we may go ahead and build some hospitals, which we need and quit fooling around with the health of our people.

We have plenty of places where we can cut, if we want to. We can cut out the entire foreign aid appropriation and it will not hurt a soul in the entire United States of America. There is enough money in their pipeline to operate for 3 years without any additional appropriation. Think that over. I will be here when the time comes, when both those bills come to the floor.

To think of the number of useless appropriations that this Congress votes for like the one I just mentioned and the thousands of people on the payroll that are useless to our Government, it is frightening to me to see the Congress go on a cutting spree and cut the heart out of a program which means so much to the health and welfare of all our people. There are those who wish to cut the entire pollution program out—a thing that endangers the health of hundreds of thousands of people in this great land of ours and renders many of our beautiful streams useless for water for domestic purposes or for recreational purposes. Right here in Washington, the beautiful Potomac River is so polluted that our experts tell us that it will require many years of study and hard

work before we can relieve it in any appreciable measure.

In my home State and in my district, we have some beautiful streams, one of them at one time was voted the most beautiful river in the world, Ouchita River. Today these streams are so badly polluted that the fish have died. The water has become so salty that the salt-water fish have come in and taken over and the thousands of fine fresh-water fish are almost extinct. Let us stop, look, and listen before we start cutting the health and welfare program. As I said before and I now repeat, we can cut off billions of dollars that will not affect any program in this great land of ours and I expect to watch for some of these bills and when they come to the floor of the House, I am going to call Congress' attention to them and see how many of you economy minded Members will join me in making cuts where they should be made.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of the committee, and particularly that of my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to a statement appearing on the news ticker, quoting the President as saying, in his press conference this morning, in response to a question, that it would be possible to cut Federal personnel a great deal without the operation of the Government suffering unduly.

Since that is one of the purposes of many of these amendments, and has been the constant purpose of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], I suggest that we on the subcommittee proceed to the task of cooperating with the President on that score.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, despite protestations to the contrary the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana substantially reducing the appropriations for grants for hospital construction will result in a reduction of the number of hospital beds to be provided in the United States in the next 2 years. The shortage of hospital beds is already a national scandal. There is not a State in the Union where this shortage is not a serious problem.

The Hill-Burton Act is one of Congress' finest contributions to our national welfare. At the time of its consideration in Congress it had almost unani-

mous approval. Yet Congress has never fully implemented the act by the original programmed appropriations deemed necessary to cope with the problem the legislation seeks to solve. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana would further reduce the good effect of this important program.

Each Member of Congress can speak best for the needs in his own area. I can attest to serious shortage of hospital beds in the St. Clair-Madison County area of Illinois. An addition to facilities at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Granite City will help the partially solve the local problem, but without Hill-Burton aid this progress will not be possible.

St. Elizabeth's has patiently waited several years for a Federal allocation to assist in financing its construction program. St. Elizabeth's will expand from a 100-bed hospital to 200 beds to service an industrial area of 75,000. It is the only hospital in the community.

The Federal program will provide \$650,000 toward a total building cost of \$2,750,000. Let us not endanger the success of this hospital-construction program by reducing appropriation to implement the Hill-Burton Act. This program is worthy of our support. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Hébert amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference how good a program is, it is not good judgment, nor is it good financing to appropriate more money than can be intelligently and effectively used, and just have it kicking around on the books. I have heard three different stories, and I do not know which one is the latest, of the amount of the unobligated balance here. One is \$86 million; another \$90 million; another \$96 million. That is the amount that will be unobligated at the end of the year. If you add any one of those amounts to the \$100 million that would be carried if this amendment is agreed to, they will have much more money than they can possibly use. Why should we be so profligate that we would set up money that could not possibly be used and that is not necessary at this time? I do not think it is good business or good policy, either.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, last Friday I reminded the House that in spite of current indications that economy has become "the chief end of man," Biblical teaching holds that charity, not economy, is considered the greatest virtue.

On Monday one of the able gentlemen of the committee took issue with this interpretation and suggested that nowhere in the Scriptures can we find evidence

that a trustee should be charitable with other people's money. Now, I make no claim to Biblical scholarship, but I must remind the gentleman that in one of the great parables the slothful servant is rebuked because he buried his talent in the ground rather than investing the talent entrusted to him in a constructive enterprise.

It seems to me that the men and women who elect us to high office do so with the expectation that we will not bury their tax funds in the ground, but will invest those funds in enterprises that bring the greatest possible benefit to the greatest number of people.

I have a very simple political philosophy which hold that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness continue to be the great goals of the American people. It is because of this conviction that I object to some of the economy proposals that have been made in recent days.

Every good citizen is in favor of economy. What disturbs me is that some gentlemen seek economy by crippling vital public programs essential to the health and the well-being of the American people. I object to the kind of economy moves that the President of the United States has described as fatuous and foolish.

I join with the President and the courageous gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in deploring shortsighted moves that save a few dollars now, but result eventually in tragic losses—both financial and human. I only wish that the President would fight as hard to save modern republicanism as has the gentleman from Rhode Island.

There is no true economy in the kind of action which the House took last week to curtail the Pure Food and Drug Administration efforts to safeguard the American people against harmful drugs or foodstuffs.

There is no true economy in the action we have just taken to curtail efforts to save our streams from contamination.

There is no true economy in the proposal now before us to curtail hospital construction and desperately needed hospital and nursing personnel.

There is no economy in curtailing the modest requests for research involving such tragic diseases as cancer, arthritis, heart disease, and mental illness.

As things now stand 1 out of 7 Americans will suffer and die from this terrible scourge. If the Members of Congress were a typical cross section of America, 62 of the 435 Members of the House who now sit in this body would die from cancer. The annual hospital bill alone of those suffering from cancer totals \$300,000. Yet, gentlemen talk about saving money by cutting efforts of our Government to bring this relentless killer under control.

Believing firmly in Federal economy, I would, nevertheless, rather go down to political defeat than cut one dollar from a medical-research program that might someday save the life of one of my children, or the life of any one of the thousands of Americans who are destined to fall victim to cancer.

With 10 million Americans afflicted with heart disease, with another 10 mil-

lion suffering from arthritis, with 1 out of 7 of us marked as cancer victims, with one out of each dozen children born this year needing institutional care for mental illness at some time during his life, how can we honestly begrudge the meager Federal investment in medical research.

It is significant that the Department of Agriculture spent in 1955 for research on plant and animal diseases \$10 million more than the United States Public Health Service devoted to research for all four of the deadly human diseases I have just mentioned.

I am completely in favor of research in the field of plant and animal diseases. I only ask that we do not reverse the action of the last Congress which demonstrated at least as much concern for the afflictions of men, women, and children as for the afflictions of the potato and the pig.

Modest as it has been, there is no denying the fact that research stimulated by World War II has already paid rich dividends in terms of a healthier America.

Between 1944 and 1952, we cut in half deaths from pneumonia, kidney diseases, TB, and syphilis; influenza fatalities were cut three-fourths; deaths from appendicitis and rheumatic fever were reduced by two-thirds. All in all, during this 8-year period, we added another 5 years to the life span of the American citizen.

When we talk about slashing the budget, we must never forget that the major portion of our budget is devoted, not to welfare measures, but to military defense and the cost of past wars. It is in this area primarily that any substantial cuts in Federal spending will have to be made.

Programs that fall within the classification of "health, education, and welfare" are, indeed, a comparatively minor part of our total budget.

In their book, *Ethics in a Business Society*, Marquis Childs and Douglass Cater cite the following facts:

In 1950 the richest nation of the world spent less than 5 cents of each Federal tax dollar for public assistance for widows, orphans, the aged, and the blind, to help educate the Nation's youth, rehabilitate the handicapped, eradicate slums, erect low-rent public housing, improve the people's health, meet the cost of all national parks, museums and libraries, and support the national school-lunch program. * * * To pay for them Uncle Sam collected less than 1 percent of the national income in fiscal 1950. For the Nation as a whole, our use of public funds, local, State, and Federal—for health, education, and assistance to the needy—amounts to two-thirds of our spending on liquor and tobacco.

We need, once in awhile, to take a look at our scale of values, both as individuals and as a nation. This is particularly true when it comes to our Federal budget. Some of the same gentlemen who have attacked medical research programs, have attacked the Rural Library Services Act on the twin grounds that it would cost too much money or is a function that should be provided by the States.

Permit me to say that the people of my great State of South Dakota are as economy minded as those of any of the 48 States and they do not favor unnecessary extension of Federal power. But when I asked my fellow South Dakotans to give me the high privilege of representing them in the Congress, I stated very clearly my firm conviction that this Government has a continuous responsibility to assist programs that are in the interest of a better America. Such a program is the Rural Library Services Act.

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, talked with deep conviction about the necessity of "the diffusion of knowledge" among the citizens of a democracy. How better can we promote "the diffusion of knowledge" than through the rural, traveling library service? I know that South Dakotans expect the Congress to use its powers to stabilize farm prices at a fair level. I am equally confident that the people of my State want the Congress to move on a modest scale to bring the blessings of good books to farm boys and girls. The minds of our children are certainly as vital to us as the very important matter of fair farm prices. I am not afraid to go on record in favor of a low-cost, modest program that has for its purpose "the diffusion of knowledge."

Economy in government? Yes, I favor that, and I will work tirelessly for it.

But what are we to say of ceremonious slashes in the budget now that later on may blight the health, the happiness, and the dignity of many thousands of Americans? No, Mr. Speaker. I will never go along with that false kind of economy. To do so would be to betray my conscience as a citizen, as a parent, and as a public servant.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I was quite disturbed yesterday by the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to the effect that a program, no matter how much it has to recommend it, should be terminated for the present since the country has such great national defense demands.

I am fully aware of the economic reasons to cut the Federal budget, particularly when there is waste involved. I am a firm believer in having Congress review most carefully the budget estimates which the Executive brings before us, and in this connection desire to commend the Committee on Appropriations and the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for a very fine job.

But I most strongly deplore a philosophy which totally disregards human values for the sake of Government economy. We have long recognized that there are certain programs which our local governments cannot carry on without Federal assistance. And when it comes to programs dealing with health or education, we cannot afford to sit back and wait. Children are children for only a certain period of time, and disease can easily lead to a national catastrophe. I find it hard to believe that anyone would place States rights ahead of human rights.

I believe in the most careful analysis of appropriations bills, particularly in the military defense field. But I am not willing to make indiscriminate cuts, particularly when this deprives our people of services that mean so much to them. It is my hope that when items are considered in the budget, that we consider the value of the program first before we apply the general principle of economy. We should think long and hard before we sweep aside the studied recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations.

Finally, I believe all of the people are well aware that these programs cost money. And yet they also know many of these problems have been getting worse from year to year and that we have been wasting both our natural and our human resources. Unless we tackle some of these problems, and tackle them hard, this country will be in serious trouble in a few years. Money spent today in many of these areas is an investment that will pay us back many fold in the future. Too many Members of this House want to sit on States rights rather than do something with them. Federal grants-in-aid help activate States rights and spur localities to action. And action is needed if we are to meet the needs of the people and avoid costly effects on the future. This amendment is certainly a glaring example of pure folly. I hope it will be defeated and if not when we meet the issue again in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the history of this legislation is that the authorizing bill was passed in 1946 under the leadership of Senator HILL and former Senator BURTON, who is now a Justice of the Supreme Court. This is called the Hill-Burton Act. The first appropriation was made in 1948. The full authorization, for which we voted unanimously here in the House, without one vote against it is \$150,000,000 for the original features of the act. We voted unanimously here to extend this act on 2 or 3 occasions, and by unanimous vote we expanded the act and increased the authorization to \$210 million not the \$121 million we have before you now. The \$121 million we have in the bill is \$3,800,000 less than we had last year.

The gentleman from Louisiana has consistently said that this will not cut out one hospital bed. Someone gave him the answer a moment ago. If you are going to cut \$21 million from this bill you are certainly going to cut out hospital beds because the money cannot be expended for any other purpose.

What is the story about the unobligated balances? There is \$80 million unobligated now out of \$250 million, because when this act was passed in 1946 they allowed the obligation of these funds to run for 2 years because it takes time for the communities to plan these buildings.

What is the history of these unobligated balances? We have appropriated since 1948 over \$900 million for this program and only \$1 million, only \$1 million out of almost a billion dollars, has

been turned back into the Federal Treasury, because it was not obligated by the end of the 2-year period provided in the basic law. Is that cause for us to get alarmed by an unobligated balance of \$80 million now, when the record shows despite anything that has been said on this amendment that out of over \$900 million we have appropriated, only \$1 million has not been used?

I will say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana that Louisiana is one of the States that has taken advantage of this program 100 percent. What are the needs down there now? Are you taking care of the needs? You still have a 25-percent deficit in the needed bed capacity in the State of Louisiana. When the gentleman offers this amendment to cut \$21 million from this bill, he is hurting his own State.

Let me tell you what the record shows: You have already received, under this program, \$25 million of Federal funds to help build needed beds in the State of Louisiana. In Louisiana now you have a deficit of 3,500 general hospital beds. That is what you need in the State of Louisiana in order to meet decent standards for the care of your people.

As far as unobligated balances are concerned, you have \$400,000 of unobligated balances in Louisiana, but over the period of 10 years not one single dollar has been turned back by the State of Louisiana.

You are not only hurting your own State, you are hurting the entire program. I do not care what you say or anybody else says, when you cut \$21 million out of this program you are denying the building of beds that are needed now.

What is the overall need? It is estimated that there is a deficit of 850,000 beds in this country. Do you know how many beds this appropriation will build in 1958? Fifteen thousand. Private interests will build maybe 30,000. That is 45,000. But we need because of the increase in population and obsolescence a minimum of hospital facilities for 55,000 more beds this year just to keep from falling further behind. So with all that is being done with the full amount that we have allowed plus all the private money that will be put into the building of hospitals, we are still going to have an increase in the deficit because of population and obsolescence of 10,000 beds in 1958. You are trying to make the situation worse by this amendment. If there is any section of the country that has benefited most as a result of this program, it is the South, especially the rural areas, because most of these buildings and facilities have been built in rural areas and towns with less than 5,000 population.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HÉBERT) there were—ayes 85, noes 107.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HÉBERT and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 106, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: Page 25, before the period at the end of line 17, insert the following: "Provided further, That no project shall be constructed in whole or in part with funds appropriated by this paragraph unless the application filed under section 625 or section 654 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the project includes assurances that upon its completion its services and facilities will be made available without distinction on the basis of race."

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the funds provided in this bill, H. R. 6287, for grants to States for hospitals and related facilities are administered, as I understand, under the laws of the respective States where the projects are to be constructed. I have no quarrel with keeping the Federal Government out of local affairs, but I do not approve of Federal money going into projects which will not be used in conformity with the law of the land.

A few days ago when the appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency was under consideration here in this chamber I asked a Member of the Committee if the Federal Government was lending funds for construction of college buildings to educational institutions where there is discrimination on account of race. I was unsuccessful in getting the information, but I believe the answer in that case is that the policy can be controlled by the agency itself and executive action. I am pursuing that matter further.

Meanwhile, however, in the so-called Hill-Burton program to help meet the shortage of hospital beds, the only method of controlling the discriminatory aspects of matching grant projects such as are contemplated under H. R. 6287, at least at the moment would seem to be by limiting by law the use of the funds appropriated.

My amendment does not compel integration. It simply provides that these Federal funds will only go toward financing construction of hospitals, diagnostic centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes where prior assurance has been given that services and facilities will be available without distinction on account of race.

I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

In Cannon's Precedents in the House of Representatives, under the heading "Construed as Legislation and Not Limitations, Therefore Not Admitted on Ap-

propriation Bills," I would like to call the attention of the Chair that this amendment goes farther than a limitation. It contains an affirmative direction that applications must contain certain assurances. This would obviously place additional duties on the Secretary of the Department and officials of the United States Public Health Service to determine that the directives were carried out.

Then I refer to page 67, Cannon's Precedents, under the heading "Executive Discretion and Limitation Coupled With Affirmative Direction," and the following page, at the top, to the provision that no part of an appropriation should be used except in a certain way, thereby restricting Executive discretion to the extent of imposing new duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I submit this is a limitation on the use of the funds. I do not believe it would entail any additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] offers an amendment to which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] raises a point of order, and suggests that the language of the amendment includes additional duties that would be imposed upon someone to determine the assurance to be given as well as the purposes at the time the application is made and under what sections of the Public Health Service Act.

The question has been raised a number of times previously. Volume 7, page 696, section 1706 of Cannon's Precedents deals with the problem very clearly and reads:

To be admissible on an appropriation bill a limitation may not include affirmative directions imposing additional duties on executives.

A limitation may not give affirmative directions, impose new duties, or be accompanied by language not directly limiting the appropriation.

The Chair, therefore, holds that the point of order is well taken and sustains the point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 25, line 17, before the period insert "Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this section shall be used for any of the purposes therein mentioned by any agency or facility which segregates citizens in facilities offered, services performed, and granted on account of race, color, ancestry or religion."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane for the same reason that the other amendment was not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the sum and substance of the gentleman's argument?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this amendment in exact language as submitted has been held to be germane for the 13 years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives and I submit the following pages in the RECORD: For instance, in the 83rd Congress, 1st session, volume 95, page 5921, where the Parliamentarian upheld my views.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, having ruled on a quite similar motion back in 1946 when the District of Columbia appropriation bill was up for consideration. The Chair held then that it was a limitation on the use of the money and so holds now, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. In ancient Rome a senator—I think his name was Cato—once said that he would rather the people would ask why there was no statue of him than why there was one. As I have listened today to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I feel he belongs in the former class, as do many who will argue both pro and con on this amendment. This is just a question of doing what one thinks is right, as far as I am concerned. I have been in this Congress for a number of sessions, and often it has to be a member of a race other than mine who offers such an amendment to protect his race. I, as a member of my race, wanted this time to get ahead of such a gentleman and offer this particular amendment. I am sorry my amendment was not germane, but I shall support the gentleman. It is time we ceased putting Federal funds into projects not in accord with the law of the land.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can ask the gentleman from Washington a question?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. This program, as the gentleman from Washington knows, has been in effect since 1945. That is when the first authorization was granted. It has been a very effective program throughout the United States during all this time. Can the gentleman tell the committee if there has been any complaint whatsoever in regard to the subject matter that the gentleman brings up now in any given area, in any hospital anywhere?

Mr. POWELL. I am sorry I cannot yield any more time, but I will answer that question.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted the gentleman from Washington to answer.

Mr. POWELL. First, I would like to say this amendment comes from the gentleman from Washington without my foreknowledge until he informed me a couple of days ago. I thought his amendment might not be germane, so that is why I prepared this, and I would like the authorship to be considered as that of the gentleman from Washington.

Yes; I do have a complaint before me from New Orleans, La., concerning a hospital in St. Charles, La. The letter comes to me from a white attorney, Maurice P. Gatlin, 1607 Claibourne Tower, New Orleans, La., in which he sent me a copy he addressed to the HEW asking the HEW to tell him whether or not the new hospital to be built was going to be built in accordance with the law of the land or would it be built in accordance with the illegal practices as outlawed by the Supreme Court decision. The HEW replied to him that lacking a directive from the Congress they would have to build the new hospital in St. Charles, La., under the old law prior to the Supreme Court decision of 1954. I submit it is proper to bring the practice of Congress up to the level of the Supreme Court. This amendment is nonracial; it is bipartisan; it is based on sound moral grounds; it is based on legal grounds, and if you are interested in placing economy on the highest level rather than on the basis of subterfuge and hypocrisy, this is it. I offer this only because my colleague from Washington did not have his amendment sustained.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the argument can and has been made that this hospital program, since its inception, has operated with few or no complaints without the necessity of such an amendment as has been offered by the gentleman from New York. Mr. POWELL, however, has pointed out a specific incident and a ruling by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which calls for new congressional guidance to the Department.

This is again an opportunity to stress the fact that there can be no compromise on the fundamental rights of all our citizens. Either there is true equality, recognized as the law by all who must administer it, or we have such a situation as has been described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. Since such situations are allowed to continue in existence, we offer to our powerful enemies a readymade argument that we do not truly intend to give more than lip service to the basic constitutional rights of all our citizens. I am afraid there are still many that for the sake of expediency are not going to face issues squarely. There are many who fear that this amendment will endanger the hospital program in the other body. If their fears are justified, it only reemphasizes the need to meet them that the American position may be removed from doubt, and our stand firm and clear.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], whose intent was perfectly clear and whose amendment could not be considered because of the rules of the committee. If the cause of complete justice does not win today, I hope its backers will return to the battle over and over again until victory is assured.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. On several other occasions, during the debate on this bill, I have opposed what I thought was legislation on an appropriation bill. If there have been any complaints about the administration of this program, I have not heard any in the 11 years I have been on this subcommittee appropriating funds for the program.

If there are specific complaints, I think they should be directed to the committee in charge of the legislation, and there should not be an attempt to take care of them in an appropriation bill in the form of a limitation such as has been suggested here today.

This program has been working well since 1948, since the first appropriation was made. I am afraid if we get into proposals such as this we are only going to get into a lot more redtape and create confusion. I submit the best way is to go before the proper legislative committee and, if there are any complaints, get them straightened out in that way.

I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

(Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I believe the budget could be drastically cut but this week's debate shows that many do not carefully consider what can be cut. Much time and oratory has been consumed in cutting appropriations for public health, postal service, anti-water pollution, and many other items completely in the public interest. Those who are in the lead today in this debate to cut these essential public activities will soon be confronted by a bill appropriating billions for foreign aid. I will not miss the mark much when I say now that on these foreign appropriations, those who now are so concerned about economizing will vote "yes" on every possible occasion that will tend to make this foreign-aid money available.

When we consider that we have appropriated for foreign aid \$130 billion since 1940 we can well ask if this money has been wisely spent. The tables of foreign expenditures for foreign aid found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday last presented by Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin, is almost unbelievable. I am certain that another huge appropriation will be made this year for the same purpose supported by those who want to curtail and greatly handicap the Public Health Service, needed money for elimination of pollution in our navigable

rivers, deny any attempt to make the farmers' dollars as valuable as dollars of any other business enterprise. That is all any support program aims doing, but I am afraid the public will find that the Members of Congress who are proclaiming necessary cuts in the budget will limit their activities to small but essential things that this country demands. They have an opportunity to track down an elephant—huge foreign aid—but when the showdown comes they will prefer to track down a rabbit instead; they prefer to get rid of potato bugs by pulling up the potato plants; they prefer to hoe up the corn stalks and let the weeds grow.

I have always voted for appropriations to further the economy of our own people, and with very few exceptions the budget does not contain unnecessary domestic demands. We can save 20 percent of this huge expenditure by limiting foreign aid, and gradually come to a point where it will be cut out altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL, there were—ayes 70, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of Indian health facilities: For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; and purchase of trailers; \$3,096,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PILLION: on page 27, strike out lines 13 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to eliminate an appropriation item of \$3,096,000 for the construction of Indian health facilities.

On page 17 of the committee report, the committee states that this amount is allowed only for "alterations" and "other plant facilities." The report specifically rejects funds for "hospitals, clinics, and personnel quarters."

The intent of the committee as expressed in the report is completely at variance with the language of this bill.

The language of the bill states the purpose of this appropriation to be:

First. The construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel.

This language clearly includes hospitals, clinics, and personnel quarters.

Now, by every rule of statutory construction, the unambiguous language of a bill prevails over a mere observation in a committee report.

In effect, the plain language of this bill appropriates \$3,096,000 for exactly the purposes which the committee, in its report, wishes to disallow, that is, hospitals, clinics, and personnel quarters.

The second objection to this item is the one made by the committee itself in

its report. On page 17, the committee states that no allowance is made for these purposes because "such a large unobligated balance exists."

This Bureau had \$5,535,000 available in fiscal 1956. An additional \$8,762,000 was appropriated for fiscal 1957. Of the total, \$13,297,000, only \$2,304,000 was obligated as of January 1, 1957.

On page 631 of the President's budget, it is estimated that 1958 expenditures will be \$3,476,000.

The Bureau now has more than \$10 million on hand that is unobligated. At the present rate of obligation, the Bureau has sufficient funds to continue its program until beyond January 1, 1960, without any part of the \$3,096,000 asked for in this item.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I have here some figures that I have just obtained. They show unexpended and unallocated funds as of March 28, 1957, of \$10,203,000, so the effect of the gentleman's amendment would just be to keep from piling up on top of these unexpended funds another \$3 million; is not that correct?

Mr. PILLION. That is exactly correct. One of the great errors we are making in this House is in permitting these bureaus to have funds for more than 1 year, for 5 or 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment upon this debate.

After listening to the charges and countercharges made by some of our distinguished Members, it would appear that we may be losing sight of the ultimate goal of this drive for a reduction in appropriations.

I dare say every Member of this House is in favor of a balanced budget, some reduction in taxes, and some reduction in our public debt.

Before this session ends, and certainly during the next session, both political parties will be competing to take credit for tax-reduction proposals.

The distinguished chairman of this committee has repeatedly emphasized the relationship between a vote for an authorization and a vote for an appropriation. Actually, the relationship is only a slight one.

There is, however, an inevitable cause and effect relationship between appropriations and taxes.

Today's reductions in appropriations are tomorrow's tax cuts.

My votes for reductions in appropriations are motivated by a personal goal for tax reductions.

I would vote for an increase in personal exemptions from \$600 to \$700. This would cost about \$2.3 billion per year.

I would vote for a corresponding reduction in business and excise taxes of about \$1.5 billion per year.

I would like to see a minimum surplus of \$2 billion applied to a reduction of our national debt.

I expect to vote for a minimum of \$5 billion in appropriation reductions. This action, will, in my own mind, justify my anticipated votes for tax reductions.

If each Member could work out his own personal tax reduction program and vote to reduce appropriations by the same approximate figure, this House could produce some astounding and constructive results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has expired.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I must object, especially since this is an excellent statement and one that the House badly needs to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois object?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the House that in August of 1954 of the 83d Congress transferred all the Indian health services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service. That is just 2½ years ago. That was a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and it was reported out by Republican committees on both sides of the Congress. When the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, testified about this bill before the Committee on the Interior, he said:

I recognize perfectly that the Public Health Service cannot perform miracles in this field and nobody is suggesting that right away they will be able to solve all the difficulties at hand, we recognize that there will be some difficulties and some administrative problems in such a transfer.

And there have been difficulties and there have been administrative problems. It has taken a long time to work out the details of such a transfer, but right now the Public Health Service is prepared and ready to go ahead and really to begin to build these Indian hospitals and do the job that is necessary.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this proposed appropriation will not add one thing to the construction of your hospitals because you now have \$7,851,400. So this will not do what the gentleman hopes it will do in building a hospital. Let me say to the gentleman from Montana, I think we should make progress with respect to Indian facilities for health, but I do not think this is the way to do it. I will go along with the gentleman in working on Indian health problems if the Department will come in here with a program that will move forward and make some progress on it. I cannot see where adding \$3 million on top of an unexpended, unobligated \$10 million will do anything that the gentleman and I want to do.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Florida that I have a bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which will enable Indians and the surrounding

communities to take advantage of some of this unobligated money. I will say to the gentleman that I have an amendment at the desk which I believe will facilitate the building of Indian hospitals by the Public Health Service.

But I want to point out that in the State of Montana there was at one time a tuberculosis death rate of 165 per hundred thousand Indians as against a death rate of 27.3 for non-Indians. As the result of an appropriation from Congress several years ago which built a 100-bed Indian tuberculosis hospital, that Indian death rate dropped from 165 per hundred thousand to 65.2 per hundred thousand, merely as the result of having adequate tuberculosis hospitalization for the Indians in the State of Montana.

I could read you statistics about the Indian health throughout the country that would alarm you. Ten times as many Indian babies die of gastritis and enteritis as white babies. The death rate from tuberculosis is more than 10 times the white death rate.

For pneumonia, in the State of Montana we have 1,543 cases per hundred thousand amongst Indians. The non-Indian death rate for the United States is 11.4. In other words the Indian death rate is more than 100 times greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the move to cut funds for Indian health facilities. I know from personal observation and investigation that the health difficulties of the American Indian constitute a critical national problem.

The incidence of disease and death among our Indian citizens is so much higher than the average among whites that it constitutes a national disgrace. We cannot in good conscience deny to our Indian friends this modest request for medical facilities that can save the lives of thousands of Indian boys and girls, men and women.

When the first white settlers came to this country 300 years ago the Indian was already established here in a culture many hundreds of years old. What followed was the gradual deterioration of the Indian's society and his way of life. The red man was driven before the advancing white settlements and eventually confined to a few reservation areas.

Having disrupted Indian society and having assured the Indian that in exchange for his land we would help meet his basic human needs, we cannot now curtail a program vital to the health of these depressed people. Our first citizens are entitled to at least as adequate a point 4 program as we are providing for people in other lands. The blunt fact is that the Indian families of America and especially the Sioux Tribes of my State constitute the most tragically neglected group in our Nation today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from New York who offered this amendment, that we stated specifically in our report that we did not allow any funds for the things he mentioned in his presentation before us; and I will say to the gentleman from Florida exactly the same thing.

This \$3,096,000 is a reduction of \$2,704,000 from the request that the administration made, and a reduction of \$5,666,000 below what we appropriated in 1957.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman agree that the language of the bill is in accord with what the House is concerned with, what the Senate is concerned with, and what the administration is concerned with?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not agree to that at all. The language of the report will supersede the language of the bill because it is under specific instructions that we have not allowed funds for these purposes.

We have allowed funds for only those two items on page 689 of the hearings. The first item that we changed was \$650,000 for hospital and clinics. We denied that; we did not give that to them.

The next item was personnel quarters, \$2,054,000. We denied that.

We did allow for alterations \$2,596,000 and \$500,000 for other plant facilities, because of the need that exists in the 56 hospitals they have at the present time.

If you could go through some of these hospitals on these reservations and see the condition, you would not try to stop this program of altering the hospitals so as to make them accredited hospitals. Those hospitals for which we now provide funds for alterations comprise just half of the program that has already been started and is already underway at a cost of some \$6 million.

All this \$3 million amounts to is that they will be given this two-million-five-hundred-thousand-some-odd dollars to continue the plan of alteration that will make them accredited hospitals under the standards of the Hill-Burton Act.

If you do not want to do that you should vote for the amendment.

The \$500,000 we have allowed is to provide sewage disposal plants and power

facilities that are connected with existing facilities in these areas now.

There is not one dime in here for anything other than the things we have set forth in our report. They cannot, and I am sure they will not, go beyond the wording of the report in which we said specifically that none of these funds can be used for the purpose the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I gather from the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that the money carried over from previous years is money which cannot be used for the purposes which the gentleman is attempting to correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is positively right. The unobligated balances are committed to specific projects approved by the Congress in prior years and they are not available for new requirements.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman figures that if this program is to go on, the new money called for in this bill is required.

Mr. FOGARTY. All of this new money that we have in here is for alterations and improvement of plant facilities, some of which are inadequate. That is all and nothing else. We found fault with the administration of this program for not proceeding at a faster rate. It took them much more time to draw the plans and specifications for some of the housing for the Public Health personnel that we are trying to get, out in the field where the Indians are. If you vote for this amendment you are voting for substandard hospital facilities for these Indians. In that way you are making them second-class citizens. If you want to do that you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to join the gentleman in his expression of opposition to this amendment. We have a tuberculosis death rate among Indians 10 times as high as that which exists among the non-Indian population. We have an infant mortality rate far above that of the non-Indian population. This is an effort to catch up and do something in a long-neglected field and I certainly hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There has been a lot of discussion during this debate about whether the Congress and the Federal Government are responsible for helping build various facilities in the cities and States. But responsibility for the American Indian is a field about which there can be no question. It is strictly a Federal responsibility.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. We have our GI programs to help our soldiers who have been away from home 2 or 3 years become readjusted when they come back. We have

point 4 programs all over the world to help other peoples achieve better health and gain skills. Would it not be an incredible proposition for us to cut down on these programs to help the Indians right here in America achieve health standards that will approach the levels of decency that we want for peoples abroad and which we have for ourselves?

Mr. FOGARTY. This amendment would have the effect of stopping in its tracks alterations that are going on, that have not been completed, which are in the process of being completed today. That is what this amendment would do and nothing else.

Mr. JUDD. I was the author of the bill which only 2 years ago transferred the Indian medical service to the Public Health Service. Of course, it takes time and extra funds to get the problem surveyed and suitable programs put into operation. There are 250 Indian tribes scattered all over the country, some in very inaccessible places, in our country and Alaska. The Public Health Service has made a fine start. I think we ought to reject this amendment and give them a chance to go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PILLION) there were—ayes 49, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. METCALF: On page 27, line 19, after "June 30, 1959:", strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of line 20 and change the semicolon to a period.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have been disturbed, as the gentleman from Florida is disturbed, and the committee was evidently disturbed, by the failure to show more progress in the construction of Indian health facilities. When the bill offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] was passed to transfer the Indian health facilities from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service it was contemplated and intended that it was to be a complete and outright transfer.

The first appropriation bill, it is true, contained the language I am seeking to strike out, namely, "Provided, That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior."

I think there was a good and just cause to have that language in the appropriation bill at that time because it was necessary then to use the facilities, the knowledge and the experience of the Department of the Interior.

But, I am told now that that language, which is permissive, which says "may," which permits the Public Health Service to take advantage and to use the experience and the knowledge and the background of the Department of the Interior, has been construed as mandatory, so that instead of 1 agency, the Public Health Service, operating in this field, we still have 2 agencies, the Department of the Interior and the Public Health Service. So, I submit this amendment to make it abundantly clear that the only

agency that is supposed to be in charge of the construction of Indian hospitals and these other facilities that are enumerated in this section of the act is the Public Health Service. The Department of the Interior is not to have anything to do with it; not permitted to drag its feet. We are not going to be permitted to go back to the old days when the Bureau of Indian Affairs had control over the Indian health service, and we are going to remedy the situation just as we tried to do under the Judd bill. That is the only purpose of the amendment. And, I still believe that if the Public Health Service does need advice and consultation with the Department of the Interior, without such language they would have that opportunity.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. This proviso was put in for the specific purpose of allowing this work to continue in the most expeditious manner, and we were convinced by the administration that as long as this office in the Department of the Interior had their own group set up there, it might be well for them to administer it. And, we considered it as permissive when we said "may." Now, it is the Budget Bureau, as I understand, that has said no, the Department of the Interior should perform this work, because they have the personnel and they have the know-how and they are the ones that have been handling this type of work. And, certainly if there is any evidence at all that the Department of the Interior is to blame for the holding up of the construction that has been authorized in this field and there is some evidence that the Public Health Service might do it more efficiently and cheaper, why, we would have no objection to striking this proviso.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my understanding that one of the purposes of including the language which is provided as a proviso is that certain types of construction, such as quarters for personnel, can be handled more economically and more expeditiously on reservation areas if it is handled through the Department of the Interior. Now, insofar as the actual hospital facilities are concerned, I share the gentleman's view that the responsibility should be isolated and centralized in the Public Health Service.

Mr. METCALF. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that it was my belief that it would have been well to have the Department of the Interior consulted all along the line and that there was good reason for including this amendment, but when it is construed as mandatory language and when the Public Health Service is required, as I am told they are required, to operate the construction through the Department of the Interior—and the Department of the Interior has many other construction facilities in addition to the construction

of Indian facilities—then I believe it is time to eliminate this language and make it clear that the Public Health Service is the responsible agency and the Department of the Interior is to have nothing to do with it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I take this time just to question the author of this amendment a moment or two further concerning this particular legislation. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman that the responsibility should be localized. You will recall that when the fight took place on the floor in connection with the bill of the gentleman from Minnesota in the first place, that one of the reasons we who opposed that legislation were doubtful about it was the division of responsibility as to the care of our Indian people.

Now that that responsibility has been definitely placed in the hands of the Public Health Service, insofar as all health matters are concerned, I certainly would not want to water down that responsibility; but if in the interest of efficiency and getting a job done, a permissive proviso within this bill would make it possible to do the job better and more quickly through certain construction activities in the Department of the Interior, then would not the gentleman agree, rather than to strike this language, it should be made clear on its face as being permissive in character?

Mr. METCALF. I do not see how it could be made any clearer. The word "may" is permissive. It is construed as being permissive. It may be that as a result of this colloquy on the floor we have made it sufficiently plain that the legislative intent is that the Public Health Service shall be in charge of the construction and the Department of the Interior consulted only when such consultation is requested.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that if the proviso is kept in the bill, we make it absolutely clear in the record that the Public Health Service should have the authority to decide whether it shall expend these funds through its own agencies or through the Department of the Interior. I imagine that the present language would be interpreted in this way, since the language is permissive, that some people in the Department of the Interior would insist that certain funds must be handled through the Department of the Interior; and there would be a big hassle back and forth between the two Departments as to which should spend the funds. I think the decision as to which should spend them should be made by the Public Health Service. But wherever and whenever the Public Health Service can get health facilities for the Indians built more efficiently through the Department of the Interior, then the Public Health Service should have permission to spend them through the other Department. But the decision should be in the hands of the Public Health Service.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is exactly correct on that and if the gentleman would offer a substitute amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] adding language after the phrase "That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior," "on the decision of the Public Health Service" I think we would have that taken care of and would be in a position where the Public Health Service had the responsibility but for reasons of efficiency the actual job could in some instances be done better by the Department of Interior officials.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to do this on the floor. May I ask the gentleman if he would accept as a substitute to his amendment, the insertion on line 20 before the period these words "subject to the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare"? I do not have the amendment written out.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete accord with both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. I would accept that or any other language which would do the same thing.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Why not handle it the same way we handled the construction program under Public Law 815? In that case we did not want the Department of Education to set up an Engineer Inspection Service, so we required that that work be done by General Services Administration. Why not let the Public Health Service have the administration of it but require that the engineering and inspection work be done by the General Services Administration? It worked fine in the case of Public Law 815.

Mr. JUDD. With reference to the question of how and by whom the expenditures are to be made, I think if we make that subject to the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, there will be no question of where the jurisdiction lies.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I would suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that my amendment is to strike that language. I would suggest that perhaps he could add a perfecting amendment to the paragraph, rather than offering a substitute to my amendment.

Mr. JUDD. My substitute would leave the proviso in the bill and add to it "at the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare." If it is better to offer a perfecting amendment, we will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that lawyers are individuals who do not render any worthwhile service in the House. I have heard that argued at times. But look at page 27, lines 19 and 20 of the bill and then see if you can remember what this amendment is. It is to strike out "Provided, That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior." See that word "may"? Do Members know what it means? May I ask the gentleman who has charge of the bill, Does he accept this amendment? Did I correctly understand that he did?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not say we accepted or rejected it. I said that as far as I was concerned if it was determined to be the more efficient way of operating this program it would be O. K. with us, because we were not responsible for this being pushed into the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not this the situation, that at some time in the past the Congress thought that Interior might be helpful to Public Health?

Mr. FOGARTY. In the construction of these works? Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. FOGARTY. We allowed it. We thought this language to be permissive, but the Bureau of the Budget has said it is not permissive. They have determined that the Department of the Interior should do this work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the budget says "may" means "shall," then the individual who so decided is overeducated or should be sent back to the little red schoolhouse. But the responsibility for this program now under discussion rests with Public Health?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All the language in the bill does is say that if Health wants to use Interior because Health thinks Interior may do a better job, it may?

Mr. FOGARTY. Interior already has the job to do this construction work where they have the personnel set up. I understand that was the reason behind the Bureau of the Budget's thinking it could be done more efficiently, because they had the setup to do it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. That is exactly the point I was making, that I thought, as the rest of the Members of the Congress thought, that it would be well to use the facilities of the Department of the Interior; but if this is mandatory and it is necessary to use the facilities, then our attempt to transfer the Indian Health Service to the Public Health Service has just resulted in the creation of two bureaus.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the amendment the gentleman offered is adopted, then Health cannot use Interior, can it?

Mr. METCALF. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You see where you are getting? You force Health to do

the work even though Interior can do it better and at less cost.

Mr. METCALF. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota has a substitute amendment that would do the same thing. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. To put that other one in?

Mr. METCALF. To withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And take the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot yield for that. That would not help us. What is the idea, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it does help.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The very distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, knows what "may" means, does he not? The word is permissive, is it not?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman believes that Health should have something to say about it, does he not?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota wants construction to be under the direction of Public Health Service?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman from Minnesota is in favor of permitting Interior when requested by Health to help out?

Mr. JUDD. That is exactly right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what this language does now in the bill says and does. How silly can we get?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is perfectly right that this language in the bill does not do what we want. That is why I offered a suggestion that would correct it. The gentleman from Wisconsin will now offer it formally in writing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not yield any more. Just how many words does it take to make "may" permissive? "You may."

Mr. JUDD. But who is to determine that he may?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Beyond any doubt or question Health does.

When an amendment is necessary to define the three letter word "may" as meaning permissive I give up. One would think we were being paid by the word.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A substitute is not in order to a motion to strike out. The gentleman can offer a perfecting amendment to the paragraph.

Mr. LAIRD. That is what I should offer, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the paragraph offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 27, line 20, after "Interior", insert "at the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is clarify what the committee thought the language meant in this bill. This same language was carried in this appropriation bill last year and the word "may" was not intended to be mandatory language.

The Bureau of the Budget's ruling is hard to understand. I cannot understand how the sentence referred to by the gentleman from Montana, can be construed as mandatory language.

I think we all agree that the responsibility for this program should rest squarely on the shoulders of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. For that reason, I believe this amendment will clearly place the responsibility with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but will give the authority to the Secretary to use services of certain personnel, if necessary, in the Department of the Interior. That is what our committee was trying to do in carrying this language forward in this appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does that mean an expansion of the personnel?

Mr. LAIRD. It does not mean any expansion. This language was carried in the bill last year. The word "may" was interpreted by our committee to give permissive authority. Certainly, we had always assumed, and I am sure the gentleman would assume, that the word "may" would give permissive authority.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think that due to this authority there will be any expansion?

Mr. LAIRD. No. I would not offer this amendment if it meant any expansion of personnel. This places the authority in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare where it should be.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. What the gentleman's amendment does is end the existing division of authority; is that not correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. The purpose of it is to make clear that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is the one who will be making the permissive decisions.

Mr. LAIRD. The Secretary will have the responsibility.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. He can permit, whenever it is to his advantage and the advantage of the Indians to do it through the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa insist upon the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again; was that an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a perfecting amendment to the paragraph.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the paragraph offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 27, line 20, after the word "Interior", insert "at the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Institutes of Health, general research and services: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the act; regulation and preparation of biologic products, and conduct of research related thereto; not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$14,026,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate the facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning on page 28. No, Mr. Chairman, I think we are on page 21 now.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is referring to page 28, the Clerk has read page 28 down to and including line 15.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the point of order I wish to make is against the language beginning on line 6 down to and including line 10 except the word "Provided." I make the point of order against the language on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in that it requires additional services to be rendered by the Surgeon General.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman withhold his point

of order until we see what this amendment does?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this being in the bill is that all of the categorical institutes that we have such as cancer, mental health, heart, arthritis, allergy, neurology and so on, get their appropriations by virtue of this language, and if this language is stricken out, it is going to make it more inefficient in the operation of the institutes. The only reason the language was put in there in the first place is to have a more efficient operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Does the gentleman from Michigan want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order against the language contained on page 28 of the bill beginning in line 6 and continuing through line 10. The Chair has examined the language and finds that this is purely legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, must sustain the point of order.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against the language on page 28 of the bill beginning in line 10 and continuing through the balance of the paragraph, and reading as follows:

Provided further, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.

The argument is the same, that the Surgeon General is required to enter into other and additional activities. He is required by that language to operate a cafeteria or restaurant.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. The only reason I can give in respect to this language is the same as that already given, that this permits the Institutes of Health to run a cafeteria and to be reimbursed for the cost of running it.

Striking out this amendment will only increase the cost. The gentleman by making his point of order is going in reverse.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair must hold that the same reasoning that applied to the previous proviso applies to this one.

The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because we have now reached in the bill the National Institutes of Health about which I have made previous remarks stating that

when we came to that point I was going to offer some amendments. The atmosphere of the discussion which I had requested be kept on an objective plane, has been emotional rather than objective. It is very obvious that a sensitive matter like this cannot be discussed objectively on the floor of the House at this time. I, therefore, will not offer these amendments. I wish, however, to state for the consideration of the House that the true issue was very well stated by Dr. Gerard who supported the mental health program. I refer my colleagues to page 41 of the hearings, the volume that includes the statements of Members of Congress and organizations and interested individuals. I read the following:

Dr. GERARD. What magnitude of funds could be used effectively from year to year for such a developing program is largely guess at the present. Forced draft could result in more damage than speed; if too much money were suddenly expended, the few competent workers would be lured here and there and effective work disrupted, and many incompetent workers would enter the field and trivial investigations would clutter up space and other resources and muddy the literature. On the other hand, inadequate, uncertain, or ephemeral funds would prevent the sound buildup of personnel, program, and facilities, especially for the longer range goals indicated earlier. I am sure the Congress has reason, from past performance, to trust the National Institute of Mental Health and the Psychopharmacology Service Center and their advisers to handle with responsibility funds made available to them.

That states the issue. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] asked us to read the testimony. I have read the testimony, and what alarms me is that the basic issue that ought to be considered objectively was not discussed by the witnesses in the hearings. This is not a question of who is for or against cancer, heart disease, or any of these other crippling diseases. It should be unnecessary to say that, of course, we are all against these social evils. It is a question of how we should go about combating these diseases. What is to be the relationship and balance between private enterprise, the State and local programs, and the Federal program? What are the Federal programs to be? Indeed, we can damage this program if we go about it in a blind way and on an appeal solely to emotion. As a matter of fact, last year it was very obvious that we went too fast. We doubled the amount available in these programs in 1957 over 1956. This was \$50 million more than the administration recommended. The planning was considerably behind the appropriation. Ten million dollars of the appropriation will be turned back as unobligated and unexpended this June 30. That is the kind of procedure that can damage these programs we say we are for. If we really wish to further these programs we must consider them carefully.

My hope is that in the ensuing months we will start thinking about these matters objectively. Members should be able to come down here on the floor of the House to discuss the details and get into the meat of these programs without

being accused of trying to wreck the program or of not being interested in it. The hearings should go into the details of the programs instead of merely setting forth generalities, which may or may not be well founded.

Finally, let me say that every one of these are open-end programs. They are authorized and there is no limit to where they can go except by appropriations. We see an example on page 44 of how far we have gone:

Mr. FOGARTY. Doctor, what about the advisability of a rabbi, a minister, or a priest receiving some psychiatric training? Are we doing more of that than we used to?

Dr. BRACELAND. Very much. There is an academy now dealing in psychiatry. It has a full-time secretary in the office and men from all denominations are in there. They have received funds.

It could be argued that might be a meritorious program, but that should not be decided by the Appropriations Committee. Those matters are all matters to be decided by legislative committees to see where and how far we are going with these programs and how we can keep our Federal programs in proper balance with private enterprise and local governments. If we do not start thinking along these lines pretty soon, we will badly damage these overall programs.

(Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD prior to the vote on the water-pollution-treatment amendment.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree thoroughly with the gentleman from Missouri. My only regret is we do not have more money in the National Institutes of Health than we have this year. I think if we did have we could spend it wisely and expeditiously and we could do a much better job with it and save many lives.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Why then in the hearings did not the gentleman and his committee go into these details so that a person reading the hearings could find out what was being done in private work compared with the Government, what the ratio is, for example, what is being done here and what is being done there? You can read all of the testimony and all there is to it is a lot of fine generalities which we all agree with but none of the details of the programs are set forth, for instance as to what the Federal Government is doing and what is being done locally in the schools, and so forth.

Mr. FOGARTY. Maybe there is not as much detail as the gentleman would like, but if he would go back 10 years and read the history of these appropriations, he would have every detail he wanted.

We did not arrive at these figures on the basis of testimony of just so-called bureaucrats in Government. We brought in some of the best doctors in the world. If the gentleman can

bring in any doctor who will refute anything that has been said, or quote some doctor friend of his that has more knowledge on these subjects than we have, I welcome the gentleman to appear before our committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I can assure the gentleman I will be before the committee next year. Let me say this: The doctors are very fine men, but the statements of those doctors deal only in what we might term as glittering generalities.

Mr. FOGARTY. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is my conclusion. Of course, the gentleman can disagree. I want to say that this is a field in which I am not completely inexperienced. It is a field with which I am deeply concerned. My information does not rest on what is in the hearings. But there is only one way we are going to have these programs. I know the gentleman is sincerely interested in them, but we have to go into them objectively and remove the emotional talk that goes with this and grant to those who disagree with the gentleman a hearing. They are also interested.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think the gentleman can charge any of us with emotionalism. We are out trying to provide funds for research that will save lives and help persons who are afflicted with physical problems. As an example, I should like to take a few minutes to discuss one of the most serious public-health problems facing America today. I refer specifically to the problem of hearing disorders and to the lack of adequate research efforts to cope with it.

Today there are an estimated 15 million Americans—men, women, and children—with some sort of hearing defect. Of this number, about 4 million are seriously handicapped and about 170,000 are totally deaf. In short, there are more Americans with hearing defects than there are with virtually any other type of disorder to which man is exposed.

What are we doing about this terrible problem? Very, very little. We have, in fact, barely begun to develop the knowledge and techniques we must have if we are to understand the nature and causes of deafness and if we are to develop truly effective preventive measures and treatments.

Granted, a good deal is being accomplished through the nationwide rehabilitation program. Progress is being made to restore many of those with hearing disabilities to productive lives and I think there will be even greater progress as the rehabilitation effort gains momentum.

But this does not begin to take the measure of the hearing problem in America. It does not begin to reduce the social and economic strain focused upon the hundreds of thousands of people with severe hearing loss. It does not make jobs for many who could hold them if some way could be found to compensate for deafness—some way which was consistent with their skills as well as with the needs of the prospective employer.

And, most certainly, the rehabilitation effort—as fine as it is—is not the answer to the hearing problems which will confront the generations of the future.

No, the basic, long-range answer to the hearing problem lies in better understanding of the nature and causes of deafness and in the development of means of effectively treating or preventing hearing defects. And this is a matter for medical research.

Most of us here are well aware that the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness in Bethesda, Md., is conducting a broad-based research attack against the neurological and sensory diseases. The Institute's program has been in full operation for only 3 years and many advances have been made against the major neurological maimers and killers in that time. But 3 years is not a very long time and there are some disorders of the senses in which research efforts are just getting under way.

Hearing research is one of these areas in which very little has been done. This applies not only to the Institute but to research organizations throughout the country. The Institute has made some modest beginnings during the current fiscal year. Something in excess of \$400,000 has been awarded for hearing research grants and, as of February, three grants had been made for the training of hearing researchers.

But, as I have said, this is only a beginning. In light of the tremendous problem posed by hearing defects, the time has come to develop a full-fledged, coordinated program in hearing research. The time has come to devote enough money to meet and solve a problem whose cost cannot begin to be measured in human, social and economic terms.

Consider, if you will, some of the many gaps in hearing research—the research areas in which little or nothing has been done. There is a vital need to study and understand the nerve system that connects the hearing organ and the brain. We do not, in fact, know what the specific function of the brain is in the hearing process and—only in the past year—research at the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness has shown that the brain's role in that process is very different from what most of us had been led to believe over the past 20 years.

Another area of hearing research which had been greatly neglected had to do with the development of new electronic techniques for analysis of the hearing system. Still other neglected areas involve the relationship between deafness and psychological factors, the neurological aspects of deafness, the effect of noise upon the hearing process and the evaluation of surgery as a means of coping with hearing disorders.

There are many other gap areas as well but these, I think, illustrate all too clearly the scope of the hearing problem and of the research required to meet it. Clearly, however, we cannot separate the research effort from the skilled manpower needed to carry it forward. There is a pressing need for both investigators and for teachers in the hearing field.

There is a need to develop and support well-rounded graduate teaching programs. There is a need to further pursue our evaluation of training resources in this country and to encourage their development and expansion. There is a vital need for more fellowships and traineeships at the graduate level—for funds which would give us more research specialists in hearing as rapidly as possible.

Are we to stand idly by amidst 15 million Americans with hearing defects, amidst 4 million with severe hearing handicaps? Can we afford to be penny wise and dollar foolish? Are we to be satisfied with cutting costs even if it means relegating the productive capacity of millions of our fellow citizens to the occupational dust heap? Are we, then, at the point where we can justify a failure to appropriate adequate funds with no reference to what the failure will cost in human and social terms?

I say the answer is "No." I say that, both as legislators devoted to our country and as human beings devoted to the welfare of our people, we have no recourse but to do something about this hearing problem and to do it now.

Today, the facilities stand ready in many parts of the country to do the research demanded by the hearing problem. Given the kind of support which only the Congress can give, these facilities will do this research and many others will shortly join them.

Today, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness has the basic facilities to take on the kind of expanded hearing research program which both conscience and necessity demand of us. Given the proper support, the Institute, I am sure, will not only develop the kind of program we need but will also serve—through its grants-in-aid program—as a coordinating influence which will bring research organizations throughout the country into the hearing research fold. And, I might add, that this would be done in a manner fully consistent with the freedom of investigation of both the cooperating institutions and of the individual researchers.

Today, there are a half dozen educational institutions equipped to take on the full-time training of research investigators and teachers in the hearing field. I think it is safe to say that the list would double in a matter of months given the necessary grant-in-aid support.

I think the case for a well-rounded hearing research program speaks for itself. I know that we owe it to ourselves, to our country, and to our fellow Americans with and without hearing handicaps to make that program a reality at the earliest possible time. That is why I have taken steps this year to start some form of action to assist these people who are in need of our help. With the co-operation of the committee we have appropriated \$620,000 this year to make a start on such a program.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The most encouraging thing that I have heard here during these days of debate is the statement that was just made by the gentleman from Missouri when he addressed the House in which he said that although he had previously indicated that he would introduce amendments with respect to these important research activities of the Department of Health, upon further consideration he had come to the conclusion that he would not do so. This will enable the appropriations in the bill to stand as they are. Now, I do not wish to get into any argument with him for fear that he may change his mind. I am perfectly satisfied to let it stay right where it is. I think he has shown unusually good judgment in the statement that he has made to the committee, and I am inclined to think that when the roll call is held in the House on some of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House there will be others like him who will feel that it is best for them to change their minds and vote against the amendments. Now, I do commend him for the statement that he has made not only in not moving the amendments but that he will give the matter further study, and I certainly hope that those who have been voting in a way that has indicated to me that they had not given very great study to this matter will follow his leadership and give the matter the further study that the importance of it entitles it to have.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On page 28, lines 2 and 3, "not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. There has been a great deal of debate on the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, like a good many of my colleagues, I have listened patiently throughout this debate which has created far more heat than logic, which I regret very much. Most of the talk has appealed to the emotions and the excitement of the Members.

Yesterday we heard this from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. He said:

If you have a child 10 years old today and you have another child born tomorrow, that child born tomorrow is expected to live 10 years longer than the 10-year-old child today.

Now, surely he did not mean that because the son was born 10 years later that he was expected to live 10 years longer. He wanted us to believe that in the last 10 years we had added to the expectancy of life 10 years.

So, I called up the actuary at the social security to find out the facts, and here are the facts. In 1929 the expectancy was 57.1 years; in 1944 it was 65.2; in 1954 it was 69.6 years. In other words, in 25 years we have added 12.5 years to the life expectancy. In

the last 10 years we have added a little over 4 years in life expectancy.

Again the other day in the debate on one of these items the distinguished chairman, in regard to the category allergy, said that these two Institutes expended all of their funds. I called the Bureau of the Budget to find out about that case. In 1936 they spent \$7,575,000. In 1957, the current fiscal year, the appropriation was \$13,299,000. The Bureau of the Budget informed me that there is \$400,000 in that account which cannot be expended this year. The new appropriation is \$17,400,000 and of that amount \$1,400,000 cannot be used. They do not need the \$1,400,000 and the Bureau of the Budget informs me that they could not use it. I was going to offer an amendment to this item on allergy, but there is no use of doing so, because all one receives when he tries to suggest anything here is a threat of a rollcall. Mr. Chairman, let me say this: I would not ask any bureau or any agency of this Government to tighten its belt any more than I would be willing to tighten my own as a Congressman. And I hope that when the legislative appropriation bill comes before us we will have the good judgment to cut the fat out of that bill. I would also like to see a rollcall on the question of our new office building, on which I personally never had an opportunity to vote.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know where the gentleman got his information, but he, or someone he is quoting, certainly misrepresented the facts. As far as the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases is concerned, if he got them from the Bureau of the Budget, they did not give him the correct figures, because by the end of this year that Institute will have no unobligated balances. They already have more applications for research grants than they have money to cover. Furthermore, I am amazed that the Bureau of the Budget now states that \$1,400,000 of the amount approved by them and sent to the Congress cannot be used. How can they know at this time what applications will be received or approved in 1958?

Mr. YOUNGER. I got these figures from the assistant in Mr. Merriam's office.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not care where the gentleman got them. The fact is that in that particular Institute they have more applications approved for research this year than they have money for. That is one of the Institutes that ran out of money as far as applications are concerned.

Mr. YOUNGER. I shall have these figures confirmed and bring them back here tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman may quote me and tell his informant that I say that he does not know what he is talking about as far as unobligated balances are concerned at the end of this fiscal year.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommenda-

tions of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing constructive services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; and to contract for supplies and services by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy program; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the act; \$46,902,000.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I listened very intently to the gentleman's discussion here a moment ago about examining everything closely, screening carefully all items in this health welfare bill. However, let me call to the attention of the committee that just a few weeks ago in this House almost everybody voted for \$200 million for the Middle East. Nobody even questioned it to any extent. Nobody knew what it was for or where or how it was going to be spent, other than just it was for \$200 million. But what concerns me is the fact that the Members are getting a bit extreme about every little item here which concerns the national health and welfare of our own people, our own folks, right here in our own backyards.

There was no hesitancy at all in voting \$200 million for the Middle East, and I doubt if there will be any prolonged debate on the \$4,400,000 for foreign aid. I sincerely hope that the \$4 billion foreign-aid bill will be as carefully scrutinized as this bill we have before us today.

The Clerk read as follows:

Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the act relating to neurology and blindness, \$18,887,000.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, there are more than 4 million Americans—men, women, and children—who are mentally retarded. An estimated million and a half of our countrymen are afflicted by epilepsy. More than 2 million are the victims of crippling cerebral palsy.

It is true that many of those so afflicted have been helped to become productive human beings through modern rehabilitation methods. It is true that rehabilitation has opened the way to a decent life for many of our handicapped people even as it has added to the economic and social potential of the Nation as a whole. I think that all of us here would agree that the progress in this respect has been most heartening.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are well advised to remember that the ultimate answer to the problem posed by cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, mental retardation, epilepsy, and similar conditions lies in medical research. The answer lies in better understanding of the nature and causes of these disorders and in the development of fully effective preventives and cures.

We owe it to those afflicted, to the Nation, and—yes, to ourselves—to foster the finding of that answer at the earliest possible time. For the tragedy of these diseases is beyond measurement in social and human terms if, indeed, it can be measured at all. And the cost in terms of wasted resources and productive potential is tremendous.

Fortunately, there is a program now underway which may well bring the prevention or more effective treatment of mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and allied diseases a generation closer to realization if we but give it our support. I refer to the nationwide collaborative investigation being carried on under the auspices of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness of the National Institutes of Health.

There are now some nine medical institutions cooperating with the institute in this great research effort which—when in full swing—will bring about 150,000 women and babies under study. The investigation is designed to find out everything possible about what goes on in that crucial period from roughly 1 month after a baby is conceived to about 1 month after it is born. The doctors have a term for this span of time. They call it the prenatal period.

Today we know that diseases like cerebral palsy and mental retardation generally have their beginnings in the perinatal period. We know that a wide variety of deadly factors—factors like lack of oxygen, injury at birth, diseases in the mother—play a role in causing these crippling diseases.

But we do not know exactly what this role is. We do not know exactly how and why these influences bring on any given neurological disorder. We do not know their relative importance as causative agents. And we cannot hope for prevention or cure until we know these things.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to find the basic answers we seek, if we are to wipe out these terrible blights upon humanity, we must support the medical-research program dedicated to these ends. We must support broad-scale collaborative investigations like that directed to the perinatal period. These men of science deserve our every consideration so their great work can go forward.

Mr. Chairman, we must pay a reasonable price for the health and welfare of the American people. The funds requested for medical research in the bill now before this committee are well within the rule of reason.

The Clerk read as follows:

Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph beginning at line 9 and running down to line 13. The paragraph does not carry any amount at all. I would have no objection to the paragraph if it did, but it states "such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year." It stops there, so it requires someone in the Government somewhere

along the line to make an investigation and determine what amount is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. These funds are authorized in the basic law to be appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to have the gentleman from Rhode Island clear up the meaning of that line 12, beginning with the words "such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year." Just what does that mean?

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as the retirement pay of commissioned officers is concerned, the retirement pay is fixed by law. When they reach the retirement age we are obligated to pay them retirement at that age, and it is an indefinite appropriation for that purpose. The basic law spells out how old an officer has to be, and with how many years of service. When he reaches that age and has the required number of years of service we are obligated to pay that amount. It does not make any difference how many men there are who reach the retirement age in one certain year, we have to pay that amount whatever it may be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, no fixed amount being set out in the bill, this is purely legislative language calling upon someone to do something before this money is paid. The Chair therefore must sustain the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and publications related to public health; and conducting studies and demonstrations in public health methods; \$5,100,000.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this simply for the purpose of placing in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the cut that was made in the appropriation for the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor Wednesday March 27, page 6, line 5 of the bill. Many of the Members have asked that an explanation of what that cut amounted to be placed in the RECORD so that they could read it. Being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, from which this particular legislation came, I am placing this explanation in the RECORD at this point for anyone to read.

Mr. Chairman, for the record and in the interest of making the truth available to the American people I feel constrained to factually refer to an action taken by this distinguished committee on March 27, 1957, during its deliberations on H. R. 6287, the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I will make specific reference to the portion of the bill beginning on page 5 providing funds for the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor.

Before beginning my discussion of the committee action it might be well to briefly recall how the unemployment compensation program operates. The Federal unemployment tax is a 3 percent tax levied upon payrolls of employers of 4 or more workers during 20 weeks in a year in all but certain specified categories of employment. The tax is applicable to the first \$3,000 of annual income of workers. The employer is permitted to offset up to 90 percent of the Federal tax—2.7 percent of taxable payrolls—with State unemployment insurance taxes and is also permitted to include in the offset any State tax savings that are allowed him under the law of his State. Generally speaking this means that the proceeds of the Federal Government amount to 10 percent of the 3 percent unemployment tax or 0.3 percent of taxable payrolls. The Federal collections from this tax are used to defray Federal and State administrative expenses, and to maintain a \$200 million revolving fund used as a loan fund to assist States having insufficient funds for maintaining the State unemployment-compensation program. Excess collections not necessary for the operation of these Federal functions are returned on a pro rata basis to the States.

Against that background let us examine the effect of an amendment adopted by this committee on March 27, 1957, to H. R. 6287 whereby an amount of \$262 million that was set forth on page 6, line 5 of the bill, was reduced to \$249,814,000. This amount provided grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration. It should be stressed that these funds relate only to administrative costs of the program and do not affect the funds available for benefit purposes.

The administration had requested \$270 million for this function and the House Appropriation Committee had reduced that amount to \$262 million as indicated in the bill as reported by that committee. The action taken in this body on March 27 to reduce the appropriation to an amount slightly under \$250 million would have the effect of making available to the Bureau of Employment Security approximately the same amount of funds that was available with respect to fiscal year 1957.

It should be realized that the money appropriated for this purpose comes from the Federal unemployment account and that all the money paid into the Federal unemployment account from the Federal 3-percent tax is used exclusively for the unemployment-insurance program. As I have previously explained, excess collections under this tax are returned to the States and the States use such refunds either for the payment of unemployment insurance benefits, for the strengthening of the State unemployment insurance fund, or for State expenses in administering the program. Therefore, it is apparent that charges made to the effect that the action by this body in reducing the funds available for grants to the States to slightly under \$250 million will jeopardize the payment of unemployment compensation benefits cannot be sustained by an examination of the true facts.

Instead of weakening the program, Mr. Chairman, I suggest this action will actually strengthen the State operation of the respective State unemployment insurance programs. The States will receive larger pro rata refunds and the States will have the authority to determine whether such refunds shall be used for benefit purposes or for administration purposes rather than have the Federal Government impose on the States an obligation to spend more solely for administration.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the record the Congress has made in strengthening the Federal unemployment insurance laws since I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. That record may be summarized to include, first, improved fiscal management of unemployment insurance funds; second, extension of unemployment insurance coverage to an approximate 4 million additional workers; third, improvement in the coverage accorded maritime workers; and fourth, Federal action to strengthen the operation of State unemployment insurance programs. Much of this legislation was enacted during the 83d Congress and bears the name of a distinguished Member of this body as author and principal sponsor. I refer to my distinguished committee colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED. Support for this legislation was bipartisan just as support for the amendment adopted by this body on March 27 was also bipartisan. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking the time of this Committee in this manner, but I thought it important that the facts be made a matter of record without distortion and without bias.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to remind the Members that on last Thursday I did place in the RECORD just exactly what this cut in the Bureau of Employment Security can mean. I also explained then that when you voted to cut these expenses you were not taking anything out of the Federal Treasury at all. You were not at all affecting the rate of taxes paid as far as Federal taxes were concerned. This money all comes out of the three-tenths of 1 percent that is paid into the fund by the employers of this country.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think when the gentleman reads my statement he will find that it accurately explains what the cut is. The gentleman can make his remarks at that time. That is why I put this explanation in the RECORD.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think we spelled out in the report what these expenditures were for. They were for that specific purpose and no other purpose, regardless of what the gentleman's explanation may be.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Anyone can read the material for himself.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including clothing for patients,

and cooperation with organizations or individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$3 million.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction \$55,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 31, line 8, after "1959" strike the remainder of line 8 and line 9.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, permit me to ask the chairman of the committee who has charge of the bill: What that last sentence, "*Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration" means. What was the purpose of that please?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is the same proviso that is in other sections of the bill where the General Services Administration is charged with the responsibility of the construction of Federal buildings. We just transfer to them money out of these funds to reimburse them for the architects and for the work of inspection and other work that goes into the building of these buildings. It is just a reimbursement of these funds to the General Services Administration for the work they perform for this particular agency.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV, X, and XIV), \$1,600,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year: *Provided*, That not more than \$104,000,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be used for expenses of State and local administration: *Provided further*, That none of the amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1, 1957.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Idaho rise?

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has just been recognized to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 32, after line 21, insert the following paragraph: "Grants to States for training public-welfare personnel: For grants to States for increasing the number of adequately trained public-welfare personnel available for work in the public-assistance programs as authorized by section 705 of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$2,500,000."

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I believe that section was passed, but I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. It was not passed. My amendment was at the Clerk's desk, but the Clerk was reading so rapidly that he passed that section inadvertently.

Mr. MORANO. The Clerk had already read the item of salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance, \$2 million.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it would be very unfortunate if this amendment were defeated because of some technicality or because of a point of order.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserved the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand the gentleman has reserved the point of order. Actually, this Congress authorized this program. This program came from the Committee on Ways and Means. I feel quite certain that that great committee gave careful consideration to the program before it was approved. This House has authorized \$5 million to carry on the work. The administration has been very modest and reasonable in its request. The request was for only \$2,500,000. Unfortunately, the Committee on Appropriations struck out the item and the only explanation that is given is as follows:

Grants to States for training public welfare personnel: The request for \$2,500,000 to start this proposed new program has been disallowed.

There is no explanation as to why the Committee on Appropriations has taken upon itself the right and the authority to veto an act of Congress.

This was an act of both Houses of Congress, and I maintain that however much you might want to curtail the budget and however much you might be in favor of economy, that to eliminate this item would be false economy.

I do not believe that we should permit the Appropriations Committee to veto the action of the Ways and Means Committee and, likewise, the act of Congress through which we sought to start this training program.

The program contemplates a Federal payment of 80 percent of the training program with the other 20 percent being paid by the several States. My State of

North Carolina happens to be prepared to go forward with the training program, and I am making an effort to have this item inserted in the bill knowing full well, of course, that it will increase by \$2,500,000 the amount provided in the overall measure.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. This would not increase the original budget estimates.

Mr. COOLEY. No, no.

Mr. FOGARTY. Because we as a subcommittee would like to have had this \$2,500,000. It was cut out in the full committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not mean to say that it would be an increase.

Mr. FOGARTY. I, as chairman, believed that this was necessary, and also the item for cooperative research; and it was on that basis that we cut public assistance down to some extent because we thought that this \$2,500,000 would provide for sufficient operation of these programs.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observations. Actually the amount I am trying to put into this bill now is only half the amount authorized.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Is the gentleman sure this authorization bill was passed by the House Ways and Means Committee or was it tacked onto some measure passed by the other body?

Mr. COOLEY. I am assuming that it came from the Ways and Means Committee. Actually my recollection is, and I checked it with the clerk of the committee, the item was probably inserted in the Senate, was taken to conference, brought back to the House and approved by both the House and the Senate. Now the Appropriations Committee because of this urgent need to cut the budget has eliminated it entirely without any explanation.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman will agree that it did not originate with the House Ways and Means Committee but was tacked on by the other body.

Mr. COOLEY. I am perfectly willing to admit that it did not, but, after all, it was the function of the Ways and Means Committee and it was approved by the Members of this House; and I do not recall that the gentleman who is now interrogating me objected to it at that time. I knew what I was doing at the time when I voted for it; and I know what I am doing now in trying to reinstate it. Because administrative costs have mounted unduly. Some States that have operated with thrift and economy are being penalized, and unless we change the situation my own State of North Carolina in the months of May and June will suffer a reduction in administrative costs of about 36 percent.

Under the Social Security Act amendment of 1956, an annual appropriation for grants to States for training public welfare personnel was authorized for a period of 5 years, effective as of July 1, 1957. The administration recom-

mended an appropriation of only \$2,500,000 for the initial year of operation indicating that a substantial start toward increasing the number of adequately trained personnel could be made with the expenditure of this amount of money.

The law authorizes grants-in-aid to be made to each State under an allotment formula based on population; financial need; and the relative need for trained public welfare personnel, particularly for personnel to provide self-support and self-care services. The extent to which funds would be used by the agencies of the several States would, of course, depend upon the need for trained personnel in the States and subdivisions. The purpose of the whole program, as I understand it, is to provide the skilled workers and the help needed to enable recipients to make the greatest possible use of his own capabilities and capacities, and to achieve independent living, personal pride, and respectability. Public assistance personnel are responsible for dealing with approximately 5 million needy persons, many of whom have serious individual and family problems. The Federal Government would provide 80 percent; the States and local subdivisions would provide the additional 20 percent of the cost, for traineeships and fellowships to persons employed or preparing for employment, with public assistance agencies; for special courses of study or seminars of short duration; or for teaching grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning.

The administration indicated in the recommendation the great need for trained welfare personnel. The request was reasonable and modest, but for some unexplained reason the committee disallowed the item.

I desire to reiterate the statements I have heretofore made. I am definitely in favor of eliminating unnecessary Federal expenditures. I am in favor of reducing the gigantic budget. I am in favor of economy, but I am not in favor of false economy. I believe that this \$2,500,000 could be and indeed will be, if provided, a real investment in the welfare of people and ultimately a wise investment of Federal funds, an investment which will return great human and economic profits. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate and commend the distinguished and honorable gentleman from Rhode Island, our colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, for the splendid manner in which he has handled this rather complex and controversial measure. He has done a magnificent job. Although he has met with formidable and stubborn opposition, he has not weakened nor has he once lowered his arm in his great fight in behalf of the very worthwhile programs which are provided for in this appropriation bill. He is worthy of his chairmanship, and he deserves the gratitude of every Member of this House.

Frankly, I have not been encouraged to believe that the amendment which I have offered would escape the formidable opposition and the zealous efforts which are being made to cut indiscriminately appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. I urge you, however, to consider seriously the amendment which I have

offered, and I hope that it will be approved and accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. I urge the adoption of the amendment, the objection notwithstanding.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not in order at this point in the bill, the Clerk having read down to line 2 on page 33; and, furthermore, that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. COOLEY. May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to base his point of order upon the ground that this amount was not authorized by law?

Mr. TABER. Upon the ground that the amendment is not in order at the point where the Clerk had finished reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on that point. The gentleman from North Carolina was on his feet while the Clerk was reading. The Clerk continued to read before the gentleman had a chance to offer his amendment.

The gentleman was entitled to recognition.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 21, noes 88.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce for the benefit of the members of the committee that it is our intention, now that we have reached this point in the bill and there are only 2 or 3 more amendments to be offered, to finish reading the bill tonight, then I understand there will be an attempt made to meet early tomorrow and complete all rollcalls tomorrow.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On line 33, line 2, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,900,000."

[Mr. BUDGE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be in opposition to my good friend from Idaho all the time, but the committee did make a cut in this item. We cut it \$216,000. One of the main reasons I cannot go along with this amendment is because of the amendment we voted on last year, the change in social security, where we added to it aid to the totally and permanently disabled. That has required a bigger workload on the people who administer this program, because every month there are new States taking ad-

vantage of the act. There are only a small number now.

Another reason is that under this \$2 million we require them to make administrative reviews of the workings in the States doing work in this field. Now, I think it would have some effect on those reviews, and that is something I do not think anybody wants to interfere with.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. It is correct, is it not, that approximately \$100,000 in this item is for the purpose of training welfare personnel? Is that not correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right, but we have already in the committee eliminated \$216,000 from what they requested. So it is \$116,000 less than they would have had if they had the \$2.5 million that was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina for administration.

Mr. BUDGE. The committee print which came to the full committee says this: The increase will provide for increases in monetary costs of approximately \$100,000 and about \$152,000 for personnel and related expenses necessary in administering the new training program. Now, that means the program we have just been discussing of training welfare personnel. Is it not correct that there is still about \$100,000 in this bill to set up that program that has just been defeated by a division vote?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, I think the gentleman has a point. You can look at it that way if you want to in relation to what is in the report, but I still maintain that when we, the committee, cut the requests by \$216,000, we gave it a good slice, and at the same time we did not want to prohibit or relax the administrative reviews of our State agencies from year to year. Now, that is something that all Members of Congress have worked for many years to keep up, and that is the only way we can keep efficient operation, and that is to allow these administrative reviews.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. It is true, however, that we did allow in the subcommittee markup \$100,000 for this work, and then the full committee knocked this particular program out. In accordance with our subcommittee report this would be a correction to do away with the \$100,000 that we did allow in the subcommittee to handle the program.

Mr. FOGARTY. The whole effect of this would be to cut \$316,000 out of the administration of one of the hugest programs in the Federal Government. Now, if you want to do that and take chances and let the States go wild in the administration of their programs and cost more money in the end, this is the way to do it, by reducing administrative expenses.

Mr. LAIRD. Would not this money be tied up in terms of the committee report with this particular new program which has just been disallowed?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. I still maintain it is a \$216,000 cut in the overall budget, in the entire amount.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Am I correct in my information to the effect that we need \$105 million and in the supplemental bill we only provide \$99 million, and therefore we are \$6 million short in administrative costs for this program?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is State and local administration that the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. I know.

Mr. FOGARTY. This is Federal administration of the program that we are talking about now.

Mr. COOLEY. But we are short \$6 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. That supplemental bill is still in conference. We do not know what is going to come out of it.

Mr. COOLEY. But unless it is restored to \$105 million, we will be short \$6 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. Those are not the figures given to the committee in the first place by the administration.

Mr. COOLEY. They were not the figures?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; they were not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,800,000, together with not to exceed \$260,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL: On page 35, line 17, strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$1,588,000."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely cuts back the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary to what they were given last year. In an effort to determine the justification for the appropriation for the next year, I went back not only to the hearings themselves but to the report of the subcommittee and its chairman, whose work here has been magnificent. I find in the report which that subcommittee made on this particular item the following language:

The committee was not convinced that conditions have changed sufficiently during the last year to warrant another increase as substantial as was requested. The amount included in the bill is sufficient to cover all increases in mandatory costs and will provide about \$100,000 for increases in staff and related expenses.

I then turned back to the hearings on page 82, 83, 84, and 85, and I found this. The Secretary who was testifying at the time said:

Since my experience clearly indicates the need for greater top level assistance, I plan to recommend a change in law which will authorize a third Assistant Secretary.

He went on to say:

I do not wish to develop a centralization of operating responsibilities.

Finally the distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee was forced to ask him:

Why should you ask for double the increase you received last year?

Mr. Chairman, my position is very simple. Where I come from a public office is a public trust and every dime I am giving to appropriate or pass on is a public trust, whether it is so small an amount as \$5 or \$100,000, or whether it is in the millions or billions with which you gentlemen have been accustomed to deal. But if it is only \$5 it is important.

Only yesterday I talked over the telephone to one of my constituents. I asked him how things were down home and he said:

We are in trouble down here. You know, it is tax time. We are having to postpone the payment on the television and the payment to the insurance man and the payment on other obligations which we consider necessary to our living. What are you people up there in the Congress going to do about it? You have promised us some economy. What are you going to say now? I understand you are voting on some bill now. You are my Congressman. What do you have to say?

I am telling him here on the floor of this House that I am for economy. And I want to tell you something else. I looked at page 243 of the budget report. I admit I am not so familiar with this because I have not had the privilege of being here very long. But I find this in the budget, that we are paying one man \$25,000 and he has 2 under secretaries or assistants at \$17,500; and so on.

Maybe the people where I come from are wrong. But when we pay a man a big salary, they want him to do the job, and the people of my district and the people of this great United States have told me as a Congressman, "to tighten your belt and do your job."

I want this House to tell this Secretary and these people in that office that, "It is time to tighten your belt and do a job for America. We are paying you a big salary. We are imposing in you a great trust. We want you to give us the economy we are paying you for. We are not only hiring your services, we are hiring your brains and your abilities." That is what the American people are paying for, insofar as I am concerned.

I realize there are certain mandatory costs in this particular legislation. The thought occurred to me there, are we not going to have mandatory costs every year? Are we not going to have increases every year? If we are going to submit each year some requests for increased funds, are we not going to have trouble?

How can we ever turn to the people and say, "Well, we have cut the budget on one hand and we can give you some economy on the other"? After all, if I am correct in my understanding of the representative form of government, what I do here is for the people back home. The taxpayer is the man I have heard so little about here. Here is the Office of the Secretary. If he is a big-

capacity man, and I assume he is to earn that salary, and if he has two assistants drawing \$17,500 a year, and they are, then they have sense enough to tighten the budget and do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MASON. I am very sorry; I am in full accord, but I must object.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I understand.

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the author of this amendment was here in the last Congress, and I stand corrected on that if he was; but I will say to you who were in the last Congress that you voted for the social-security amendments which Mr. Folsom has to administer; you voted for a new Water Pollution Control Act; you voted for the Health Survey Act; you voted for the Library Services Act; you voted for the National Library of Medicine Act, and for the Health Research Facilities Act, and for Public Law 911, involving graduate training of professional public health personnel, advanced training of professional nurses, vocational education for practical nurses, and authorization for special project grants in the field of mental health; and you also voted for the Air Pollution Control Act. These are just small pieces of legislation that you voted for in the last 2 years. Now, after you have added these additional responsibilities, which are going to tax the Department tremendously, this amendment is offered to cut them \$100,000 below what they had in 1957.

When you come down here and say, "This is just a little old amendment; it ain't going to hurt them any; it's just going to cut them back to 1957," that is just not so. The amendment that has been offered by my friend will cut them \$100,000 below what they had to operate with in 1957, even though we have by our own votes given them these additional responsibilities.

You talk about the people back home. Did they not want the Library Services Act; did they not want this Water Pollution Control Act? Yes. They did not want any of these cut out. But if you want good administration you have to give these agencies the tools to work with. You cannot come down here in the well like this and make a speech such as you just delivered expecting them to tighten their belts and administer a program that is too large for them now to administer well.

We operated on this budget before you took a look at it. We allowed the Department only one-third of the increase in personnel they asked for because we wanted to be a little bit conservative too. But when you come in here now and ask them to operate on a budget that is \$100,000 less than they had in 1957, with all these new programs you voted for in the past 2 years, it just does not make good commonsense.

They are understaffed now, and you are going to understaff them further. You are going to make them lay off about 20 people, and you would be the first one to find fault when something came up in the administration of these projects where they were loosely administered, and then blame the people downtown for not doing a good job because you did not give them the tools to work with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Who fixed the salaries the gentleman mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. FOGARTY. Congress fixed them in a pay act. We voted for it. I am surprised that good men continue to accept these responsible positions for \$17,500 when they could earn much more outside the Government. They come down to Washington and do their best for their agencies and for their country, and then they are subjected to the abuse that they get on the floor of this House by remarks that have been made to the effect that they can tighten their belts and do a better job, particularly when many of them are working overtime up to 7 or 8 o'clock each night. I do not think it is fair to the Federal personnel. I do not think it is fair to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I think he is trying to do a good job with what he has. I think we ought to help him to do a good job and not hurt him and cut him off as this amendment would do.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman. This amendment does drastically reduce the employment level in the Office of the Secretary, if it is adopted in the form in which it is now presented. I repeat, I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no other way that it can work and it can only work one way. If you want to prevent him from doing a good job in administering these programs that we have passed legislation for, if you want him to administer these programs in a slipshod way, then that is the kind of administration you are asking for by voting for a cut like this. As I said before, we only gave him one-third of the personnel he asked for to administer this program. I thought that we were pretty drastic in the cut that we made. I thought we were being very conservative. But, when you come in here and ask to cut out 20 positions below what they had in 1957, in my opinion, that is going too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 51, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration: For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Administration, \$2,300,000, together with not to exceed \$700,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL: On page 35, line 22, strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert "\$1,985,000."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I told the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that he made a good speech a while ago. I think he did. I have listened here day after day with a great deal of patience, and I have listened to him time after time because he has done a good job. But, I still say it is necessary to economize. The only things I have to guide me are the reports of the committee and of the subcommittee. The reports I find in the budget and the demand from the people back home. If these be not worthy of consideration, then I stand to be corrected. I read from the report of the committee a short time ago, and I want to read again from it with reference to this particular amendment by which I seek only to take us back to the fiscal year 1957.

If you believe it does just read pages 246 and 248 and 249 of the budget, if you have not already done so.

On this particular amendment I find that the committee reported as follows:

Most of the increase was requested for grant-in-aid auditors necessary because of the increases in the grant-in-aid programs and for additional personnel to handle such work as voucher review, payrolling, etc., for the additional personnel in the field to administer the new and expanded programs authorized by the last session of Congress.

Then the committee goes on to say:

During the last few years the committee has also attempted, without success, to secure a logical explanation of why this office feels that it can perform, in the regional offices, such common services as voucher review, payrolling, processing personnel actions, etc. for other field offices of the Department more efficiently than the bureaus can perform these services themselves.

Perhaps I am wrong in raising my voice in this regard, but I want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Members of Congress, this Congress—and I was not in the last Congress—whether we are taking orders from the administrative office or from a bureaucrat? Or whether this Congress has the right to say to some bureau or department of the Government to run their organization more efficiently. Do we not have the right in keeping with the philosophy of government to say that they should use these auditing facilities of some other department of the Government rather than set up expensive personnel to duplicate the work?

I have not criticized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; I have not said he or she did a bad job. I have said this, I have said that the American people have a right to demand of me and you and of every person in the employ of the Government, whether it be

a bureaucrat, a public servant, or what-not, that he dedicate to his work the best he can give. And I say we have a right to demand this same thing of him or of her as of any other person we hire, because in private business today when you hire someone you expect the best of him, and that is what we ought to insist on in Government.

I believe if we were to tell these people that we have sought economy, we have voted for economy, we know that our people want economy, that it is up to them to do something about it, they would do something about it.

I do not want to see one single person dropped off the payroll, but I do not know that it is a crime to fire anybody in the interest of good Government; I do not know that it is a crime to cut down personnel if you can save the taxpayers millions of dollars; and if I am wrong I can be corrected at the polls.

I do not think it is wrong to demand efficiency, and I do not think it is wrong to demand economy. I did not have the privilege of being here during the last Congress or any of the preceding Congresses, but I have had the privilege of being an American taxpayer and an American citizen. Finally, I came to a Member of this distinguished body of great people, and I have found them to be great people, I have found that we have the same obligations of man to man, of Congressmen to constituent, of legislators to taxpayers.

If we just gave the taxpayer perhaps some support and encouragement he would believe in this Government like I have always believed in it as a Government based on high levels from legislators down to the man down at the grass roots, who is paying the taxes.

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the same argument can be used against the pending amendment that was used a while ago, only more so. When we considered this appropriation request we should remember that they also asked for five additional administrative officers and five additional secretaries for strengthening five regional directors' offices. We disallowed that which was for overall direction in the regional offices. The only things that we have allowed for are to take care of the expanded programs that we have voted for last year.

There are no top jobs added by the committee, I can assure you; only clerks, accountants, and auditors. Some fault has been found both by the States and Members of Congress regarding the auditing of these programs. We have been way behind in this work. We have attempted through the years to correct that situation by increasing the allowance for auditors. This amendment would cut out some of these auditors who audit the Federal grants-in-aid. It would also cut out personnel that are handling the payrolling of the field em-

ployees of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and other HEW field offices, the recruitment of personnel to carry out these programs, processing their travel vouchers, and so forth. They are working on a deficiency basis now and we have a deficiency appropriation request pending before our committee at this time because the expanded programs make it impossible to carry out this work with funds available for 1957.

Because we changed the social-security amendments last year, it resulted in a tremendous increase in the number of recipients of old-age and survivors' insurance. These people who should only wait a period of 30 days for their checks are now forced to wait a period of 60 days. Because we have not been able to recruit and train the number of personnel necessary to man these OASI offices we are falling behind in processing the claims of these people who are on relief to the extent of about 60 days. They told us in the hearing the average delay in the past was less than 30 days. Today we are making these people wait 60 days.

This is going to make matters even worse for these people who have benefits coming from the old-age and survivors' insurance fund because it will prevent the Department from recruiting and hiring the additional personnel they need to administer these programs. I do not think anyone wants to do that. I do not think anyone in this House wants to extend the time that these men and women are waiting now to draw checks from the old-age and survivors' insurance fund.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the statement just made by the chairman of the subcommittee. This particular item does have to do with the staffing of these local offices and recruiting the necessary personnel to man them. I think it would be false economy to adopt an amendment of this kind. We have now a delay all over the country, particularly in the rural areas, of some 60 days. This additional force for the Office of Field Administration is necessary if we are going to keep this under control at all.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely correct. If we adopt the pending amendment it means we are going to extend that waiting period of 60 days still further. That burden will be borne by people who do not and cannot speak for themselves, who are waiting to get these checks at the end of the month. I do not think any Member of this body wants to do that, but that is what the pending amendment would do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMP-HILL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my pro forma amendment will not require any additional money. I simply rise to ask the chair-

man of the Subcommittee on Appropriations if he knows of any group within the Department of Labor that is trying to screen the refugee workers, for instance the Hungarians who came into this country, to see that they are not put into industry thereby putting our established workers out of work. I know of a number of cases like that in the State of Massachusetts where workers have been employed for a long time in industry, then they are turned out into the streets and Hungarians, who do not speak our language, are put in their places. In other words, we are making refugees of our own workers. It seems to me these people should be placed in sections of the country where labor is needed and not to replace our own people.

Mr. FOGARTY. The answer is "No" to that specific question that the gentlewoman has asked. But we did attempt to allow some increase in funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics or the Bureau of Employment Security, I do not know which, to the extent of \$100,000 to permit them to make a study of the effects of foreign workers who are coming into this country on the local labor groups that the gentlewoman is speaking about. That allowance was cut out, however, by an amendment offered by a Member of this House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not speaking of farm laborers alone.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not, either.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am speaking of persons in industry.

Mr. FOGARTY. We had \$100,000 for that purpose in here but it was stricken out by one of the amendments that was adopted to this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am talking the matter up with the CIO and the American Federation of Labor because I think they surely ought to be very much interested in seeing that their own workers are protected. I am suggesting that they have a commission to place the Hungarians where they can be cared for and not put our labor on relief.

Mr. FOGARTY. On page 7 we did allow \$120,000 for an analysis of the effect of tariff changes on United States unemployment. That is one of the things I was referring to. But, the answer to the first question is "No." There are no employees in the Department of Labor doing what the gentlewoman asked about.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But it would be helpful if it were done to protect our own labor.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it would, yes. I do not know whether we can do it under the existing legislation in the Department of Labor, but if the gentlewoman sponsored legislation, I would be very happy to work with her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the most courteous gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I advise the gentlewoman that there were attempts made to bring Hungarian miners into the

mines of West Virginia when there are 141,000 unemployed miners in the State of West Virginia now.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, and that is tragic. We ought to take care of the Hungarians in some other way, I think.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to suggest to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the Department of Labor does have information now along the very lines that she is interested in and is making through studies of this particular matter. I received information from them just the other day on a request that I placed before them. With reference to the cut, I believe that has to do entirely with tariff studies and has no relation to the matter that was raised by the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not referring to the cut; I am referring to the general proposition.

Mr. LAIRD. The general proposition is now under study and is under constant study by the Department of Labor and the Department of Labor has information available.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We ought to take immediate action when the people's jobs are at stake. We have great respect for the courage of the Hungarians but for their own sakes we must not have them hurt our labor.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I know of the gentlewoman's deep interest for the people in our areas who are out of work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman and I know what it means so completely.

Mr. FOGARTY. And I would like to call her attention to the fact that we have—and this affects employment in this country—an item of \$120,000 for the analysis of the effect of tariff changes, and I know that she has been very much interested in tariff legislation, and this will help in that regard. If the gentlewoman will give us some help on these rollcalls, we can help her on that, too.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman has rubber industry in his district just as I have in mine, and we know what foreign competition means to that industry. Management and labor in the rubber industry were the last ones asking for tariff protection.

Mr. FOGARTY. This will help. If the gentlewoman will help tomorrow, she will be helping this situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to help.

[Mr. BUDGE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 208. Not to exceed \$2,500 of the funds available to the Department for salaries and expenses and not otherwise available for entertainment of officials of other countries or officials of international organizations shall be available for such entertainment when authorized by the Secretary.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes his point of order against the entire section?

Mr. HIESTAND. Section 203, lines 5 to 9, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to comment on this point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I must concede the point of order. The purpose of this paragraph is to entertain some of these foreign doctors and scientists who come over here, to reciprocate the entertainment that our people receive when they go over there. If the gentleman wants to strike it out, that is his privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on the point of order?

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 211. None of the funds provided herein shall be used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone in connection with the construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 211 in its entirety as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This language is purely a limitation on the use of funds, as I read it, in the bill we have before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin makes a point of order against section 211 on page 38 of the bill. The Chair has read the section and finds that it is a pure limitation, and therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); \$9,450,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935 (29 U. S. C. 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3

(f) of the act of June 25, 1938 (29 U. S. C. 203), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 percent of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SELDEN: On page 39, line 17, strike out "\$9,450,000" and insert "\$9,384,800."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The amount provided in the gentleman's amendment is \$9,384,800?

Mr. SELDEN. That is right. It is a cut of \$65,200.

Mr. FOGARTY. On behalf of the committee, Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain all Members of Congress are aware that there is growing concern throughout this country over the magnitude of the Federal budget. In my opinion, that concern is justified.

I believe, as do many in the Congress, that there are items in the 1958 budget requests of the President that can be safely reduced. At the same time, I realize that the Congress should make certain that any cuts that are made in the budget will not jeopardize the security of this Nation or scuttle programs that are vital to the well-being of its people.

With this in mind, I am offering an amendment which, if adopted, will make a small reduction in a budget item. Yet, this reduction should have little, if any, effect on the operation of the agency concerned.

The amendment now under consideration will bring about a reduction of \$65,200 in the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board. The sum of \$9,384,800, which this amendment provides, will give the National Labor Relations Board the entire amount it had in its budget for the present fiscal year plus the mandatory contribution of \$433,300 that must be made to the retirement fund.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Boyd Ledom, testified that the Board's request for funds for 1958 was geared to the same case inflow as in 1957. The amendment now before you will provide the same funds for 1958 as were provided in 1957 plus the mandatory contribution to the retirement fund.

Last year Congress reduced the budget request of the National Labor Relations Board by nearly \$2 million. The Board has operated satisfactorily despite the reduction, and one of the witnesses who appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee, in effect, so stated.

The reduction of \$65,200 provided in this amendment is less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of the committee's recommendation of nearly \$9½ million. A de-

crease of such a small percent of a budget item of this magnitude should have little, if any, effect on the operation of this important Board. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 43, immediately following line 6, insert the following: "No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for payment of any expert or consultant, or of any management engineering corporation, company, firm, or other organization, for the performance of any service relating to the management, organization, or operation of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or any related agency, unless the utilization and payment of experts or consultants, or of management engineering corporations, companies, firms, or other organizations, is specifically authorized by law for the performance of such service."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to speak to his amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but I should like the gentleman to press the point of order. There is no use in wasting time if a point of order will rest against the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Gross amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman in support of my amendment, I invite your attention to page 266 of the hearings of the subcommittee, which shows that the Department of Labor last year employed some 50 consultants apparently to look into management of that department. I also invite your attention to page 73 of the hearings wherein the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] asked representatives from the Department of Labor what services these consultants had performed. The hearings are silent as to what services these consultants performed for the Department of Labor. If I am wrong in that, and if there is anything in the hearings to establish that these 40 to 50 consultants provided any worthwhile services, I wish the gen-

tleman would so advise me and tell me where that information may be found in the hearings.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I believe I answered the gentleman last week when I said that we did not get any answer on that. That was about these management people who were hired to make a survey in the Department of Labor; is that what the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Now turn to page 266 of the hearings, we find a list of the consultants who were employed last year by the Department of Labor. There is no indication of who they are by profession or what their qualifications, and the hearings are absolutely silent as to how much this cost the taxpayer or out of what funds these people were paid. My amendment is not as restrictive as I would like to make it because I understand that to make it as restrictive as it should be would make it legislation on an appropriation bill. But, I do think it will serve as a deterrent. Let me say I intend to offer this amendment or a similar amendment to every appropriation bill that is brought to the floor of the House from here on out.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman also applies to the National Institutes of Health and other contract work that is done on the outside such as the new cancer research that we will be doing outside by contract next year with the pharmaceutical houses.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe it would apply. I want to stop this business of every department and agency of the Government going out and hiring consultants to come in and tell them what to do. We have under secretaries, assistant secretaries, deputy secretaries, and assistants to the deputies falling all over themselves all over the Government, and yet we are spending huge sums of money to hire consultants to tell them how to run the business of the various bureaus and agencies.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would make a little further inquiry, he would find that representatives of the Department of Labor sit on the consideration given to the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs. That has never been authorized by the Congress. I think the question that the gentleman raises here and the point he is making in striking that out is well taken because it is happening not only in the Department of Commerce and the Department of State, but in several other departments. There is no authorization by the Congress for any of that.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to compliment the gentleman in what he is doing. What we are doing is hiring

some of these outside firms and taking competent people out of the Government who could do this job as well as they can in some of these outside firms.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and these consultants and personnel-management experts come to our own committee staffs and get a big share of the information which they develop into extensive reports and hand back to us at fat fees and contracts.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right and I compliment the gentleman on offering his amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. Last Tuesday, when he first raised the question about these consultants who were being hired by the Department of Labor, and when he raised the question of what results we obtained from that type of consultation, I stated that as far as I knew we did not get any results. However, the reason I rise in opposition to this amendment is that the amendment goes much further than you would want to go and much further than I would want to go. I am in agreement with what the gentleman wants and what he is trying to get at. But, we have in the Public Health Service grants for research, heart disease, mental health, and so on. People in study sections.

We have advisory committees, which pass upon the applications for research before they come to the Surgeon General, that this would affect. It would affect our contracts with the pharmaceutical houses to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] referred. At the National Institutes of Health Research Center they call in outside doctors on some of these special cases on a consultative basis, and this amendment would prohibit the employment or the payment of people like that. I do not think you want that to happen. I know I do not.

But I agree with the criticism the gentleman raises because I asked that question in the hearings on the Department of Labor. I asked what savings have come about as a result of the survey that they made 2 years ago; and the answer was, "Practically nothing."

But I do not think you want to go to the degree that your amendment goes, as far as the Public Health Service is concerned. Your amendment will seriously hurt the study sections and advisory committees that pass upon the applications for research into these diseases.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. In view of the gentleman's statement I would like to ask the gentleman if he could not offer an amendment to the amendment which would take care of the needs the gentleman has expressed but also eliminate the evils that the gentleman from Iowa sought to reach.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sure we all want to correct the things the gentleman criticizes, but I think his amendment goes too far and I am concerned. If the gentleman would withdraw the amendment and offer a new amendment not so broad, which would reach the

the management surveys where they have been used in other departments, the Post Office Department and so forth, I think it would do what he wanted to do. I am sure the gentleman does not want to hurt the Public Health Service in the work they are doing of that type.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have no desire to harm any worthwhile consultative work, but let me say to the gentleman that unless something is adopted in this bill he would not have anything to go to conference on. Is not that true?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not like the idea of adopting an amendment like this that affects the basic research program of the Public Health Service as the gentleman's amendment will do. I would hope the gentleman would withdraw it and offer another amendment dealing with the overall management service problem in the Government. But if that cannot be done, the only thing I can think of is to oppose the amendment because the amendment goes much further than the gentleman wants to go, and he says so himself. It will affect the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health, and as long as it does that I just cannot go along with the amendment. We are in agreement as to the point we are trying to reach, but the gentleman's amendment goes far beyond that and I cannot support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to set forth now just what these amendments that have been passed during the last week and 2 days will do, so that Members will have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the effect they will have without going through the quite voluminous record we have built up. First, the Department of Labor.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Your action eliminated the increase for the Office of International Labor Affairs amounting to \$30,000—a small sum to insure adequacy of the knowledge of the Department in the movement of workers and worker organizations in various parts of the world. It has been said many times that labor organizations are the first target point for Communists to try and make inroads. It is important that the Secretary in recommending labor policy both here and abroad have close to him staff advisory assistance. Again I say \$30,000 is a small amount of money for this purpose.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Here is where you become very ambitious. You not only cut this office back to 1957 but you did not allow money for the mandatory increases for retirement and transfer of funds previously approved in another appropriation. In the committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$2,225,000 there was only \$22,000 for program increases. The balance was for mandatory items. If your action stands, this means a reduc-

tion of some 35 positions—this reduction coming at a time when the workload of the Solicitor's Office shows increasing activity. The Solicitor's Office is beginning to feel in greater numbers the impact of litigation as a result of the recent amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The legislative requirement that the wage orders in Puerto Rico be reviewed annually has added a new burden to this Office. I cannot take the time here to go into all the details but I assure you that evidence was supplied in committee which was definitely convincing that the staff requested was needed. If the Solicitor's Office cannot carry out his litigation responsibilities there will be complaints not only from labor but there will be complaints from employers that unfair employers are taking advantage of them. Likewise workers will not receive the wages to which they are entitled by law. The Government will be the loser because third party suits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act will have to be passed by because of insufficient staff. Thousands and thousands of dollars have been recovered by the Government through this legal technique.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

We had quite a debate on this item yesterday and I will not burden you with much detail. What you have done is quite simple. The program will be 15 percent larger in 1958 than in 1957. For this increased workload, the committee proposed a mere 4-percent increase in appropriations. You wiped out this small increase—the result of which means a deterioration of the program. More specifically you endanger an international agreement between this country and Mexico by making it impossible to carry out certain guaranties the Mexican Government requires for its nationals coming to this country to work in agriculture. Does not the figure of over 400,000 importations during the current fiscal year indicate the need for this program? As long as we enjoy a high level of employment we will need this program. As long as we enjoy a few thousands of savings is just a mistake.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

In the Bureau of Labor Standards the committee reduced the request here by \$135,700. It allowed \$119,800 increase over 1957, of which \$52,200 was for program increases. Program increases related to aiding in the employment of the physically handicapped, extension of safety service in the use of atomic energy, and improving conditions of domestic migrant workers. The balance of \$67,600 was for mandatory items. The action on the floor eliminated the program increases for enabling the Bureau to keep abreast of accident hazards in the atomic energy field and institute such action in their safety program necessary to promote safety for the workers involved.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Perhaps the most shocking thing of all has happened here. By shaving off \$136,000 from the committee recommendation, you are making necessary an ac-

tual reduction in level of operations for this most crucial activity.

As I stated on Tuesday, curtailment of other benefits for servicemen entering on duty after January 31, 1955 makes the reemployment program the only major readjustment device available to veterans.

The workload of this bureau will be substantially increased because of the buildup in the Ready Reserves. The number of reservists and National Guard men who must perform training duty in 1958 will be about 40 percent over 1956 and 25 percent over 1957. This increase is due to the fact that all military releases after August 1957 must accept duty in the Active Reserve.

Because of your action this week, this Bureau will not be able to render adequate service to the veterans.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Let us see what damage you have done in reducing the committee recommendation for the Bureau of Employment Security by \$442,000. The committee had allowed only \$89,560 for program increases including a transfer of \$53,300 from the Office of the Secretary. Cutting it back to the 1957 level without making allowances for mandatory items will make necessary the reduction of 60 positions. Let us take a look at the history. We have increased programs through legislation, increased the funds for State employment agencies, but we have done nothing to allow the national office to keep up with its expanding responsibilities. Specifically, it is responsible for supervision directly or indirectly of the handling of \$1½ billion in unemployment insurance tax collection; \$1¼ billion in unemployment insurance benefits; and one-fourth billion dollars in administrative funds. It is the one operating arm of Government that actually aids in the placement of the older worker into a job. Likewise it occupies the same role in placing physically handicapped workers into jobs they can perform. I believe you have made a terrible mistake in the action you took on Wednesday in reducing the appropriation request. If this action is sustained in the House it will cut out the new program planned to help those areas with chronic problems of unemployment; it would very seriously impair the program to increase the placement of the handicapped through the development of better programs for the State and local employment officer; and it would even stop the program for the older worker, that really was not an increase at all, but just a transfer of activities from the Secretary's Office with the intention that it evolve from a planning program into an action program.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Cutting the program increases out of the Bureau of Labor Statistics request will be disastrous. This Bureau in the field of research and statistics is considered the best in its field. Its work is used by all of us as well as by management and labor and the public. As an example, again I remind you of the danger of cutting funds needed to insure accuracy of the Consumer Price Index. Four million workers' wages go up or down as this

index moves. It must be accurate. It has become the biggest tool for settling management and labor differences on wage questions. Imagine what will happen if the accuracy of the index is questioned.

Time will not permit detail presentation of all this Bureau's programs, but I assure the Members of this body that its work in the field of wages, employment, productivity, wholesale and retail prices, are all important to our economy and they are used extensively. I think you all know that. It should not be allowed to deteriorate, but if your action stands that will be the result.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

You have sliced \$888,000 from the Wage and Hour Division, with the result that there will have to be an actual reduction in level of operations. This at a time when the rate of back wages found due is at the highest level ever—about \$20 million a year.

Two years ago, this body, by an overwhelming vote, increased the minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1. Are we now saying that we do not want to enforce that minimum? Wage-hour investigations show that 1 out of every 5 firms are violating the dollar minimum.

The committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$10,888,000 would not add a single employee to the Division. By cutting this item, you have reduced the staff and consequently reduced the level of enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Public Contracts Act.

You will cause a reduction in the already too small sample inspection check which at this time is only 7 percent of 800,000 covered establishments.

You will handicap the Division carrying out its legislative responsibility of reviewing each wage order in Puerto Rico annually. If this work lags you will hear plenty from employers in the mainland.

Then in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while there were not nearly so many amendments adopted as in the Department of Labor, the amendments that were adopted certainly will have a disastrous effect if they are sustained by the House. I want to set forth some facts regarding them also.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The Jones amendment would reduce this agency's appropriation from \$9,300,000 to \$7,973,000. This reduction would bring to an abrupt halt the orderly program, started last year, to bring this agency to the point where it can do a decent job of protecting the American men, women, and children from dangerous and filthy foods and drugs. It will stop this program that was initiated on the unanimous recommendation of a citizens committee appointed in 1954 to make an objective study of this problem. That committee recommended a threefold to fourfold expansion of this agency within a period of 5 to 10 years just to give the American people minimum assurances of protection against foods and drugs that endanger health and even life, for that matter; 1957 was the first year of the program to carry out

the citizens committee recommendations and the increase was 10 percent. The amendment would stop us at that point—a point that, according to a group of our most eminent citizens, endangers the safety of every American.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The Dorn amendment to the salaries and expenses for this office reduces the appropriation, if it passes the House, from \$7 million to \$5,518,000.

In 1957 Congress authorized the Office of Education to begin research on educational problems of the mentally retarded and in a few other highly important areas. Sixty-four research projects are now underway in cooperation with colleges, universities, and State departments of education. This is the start that was made to carry out the so-called cooperative research program in education that we authorized 2 years ago.

Estimates place the present number of school-age mentally retarded children at more than 1 million. Large numbers of those classed as mentally handicapped are potentially useful members of society providing they receive proper training and education. There is a specific need to determine what the school can reasonably do and how it can best be done. Substantial need also exists for basic research in educational problems of mentally retarded children.

If this cut is sustained, research now underway in colleges, universities, and State educational institutions would have to be cut back at once. Contracts with many of the best researchers would have to be canceled. A substantial part of the investment made to date could be lost, as most research projects must run through fiscal 1958 for completion. In this program the non-Federal participating institutions are contributing approximately 30 percent of the total cost.

This promising new program will be killed in its first year if the amendment passes.

The committee allowance for salaries in the office simply holds the 1957 level. It provides money required for full year costs of 1957 jobs and the mandatory contribution to the retirement fund. At a time when educational problems are a chief domestic concern, it does not make sense to cripple the Office of Education.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

The Shuford amendment would cut out all funds for the Committee that the President of the United States thought so highly of that he started it with funds taken from his special emergency fund. The President thought we have an emergency that this Committee can do something about. Then less than a year ago this House passed the authorization by a unanimous vote—and it did not sneak through, there was plenty of discussion about it that day. But it passed on the Consent Calendar by unanimous consent. So if this amendment passes we are certainly reneging on what we told the people last year we were going to do about this problem of education beyond the high school that the President thinks is an emergency situation.

GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS CONSTRUCTION

The amendment to delete the entire amount of \$50 million is, of course, another instance of trying to repeal an act that we passed by a substantial vote, and a record vote, by refusing to appropriate the funds to carry it out. But, aside from that, I would like to point out what this program would do and what will be lost if the House sustains this amendment.

Construction of sewage treatment plants has always been a costly proposition to municipalities. Since the end of World War II the financial problems presented by such construction have been growing in intensity due to rising costs associated with inflation, high interest rates, and the increased competition for materials and competent engineering talent. For instance, construction costs for treatment plants have more than doubled in the last 10 years. Furthermore the interest rate on municipal borrowing has risen from 1.49 percent in 1945 to 3.12 percent as of the week ending March 22, 1957. These factors in conjunction with the multitude of current demands on municipalities for public-works construction of all kinds—streets, school, utility extensions to new subdivisions, and public buildings—have produced an impact on the comparatively narrow tax base of municipalities that results in what many consider to be an excessive tax load. Since counties, school districts, and special districts overlap the municipal incorporated area and levy against the same tax base as the municipalities, the general financing problem often may reach the near crisis stage in many areas. This situation points to the necessity of extending the economic base for financing the municipalities, especially when the marked increase in urban populations is considered. The most feasible extension is to the Federal level, for at this level the tax structure and the economic base coincide to provide the most equitable basis for assistance to municipalities in recognition of the national interest involved.

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the relation of sewage treatment plant construction as provided for in this program and the control of water pollution. It has been stated that this is simply a Federal grant to localities to help them pay for local utility services. This is not the case. These grants are to step up the construction of plants to treat the increasing amount of sewage that is coming from our rapidly growing cities and towns. The benefits of a municipal sewage treatment plant are much greater to downstream water users than to the city which builds the plant. Consequently, the importance of these plants in restoring and preserving the waters of a stream so that the water can be used over again by other cities and industries transcends local interests. So if the House upholds this amendment it will not mean just withholding funds we have promised the towns and cities that will build these plants but it will mean denying all the people downstream the protection from pollution that we prom-

ised by a substantial majority, on a roll-call vote, when we passed the new Water Pollution Control Act.

At present, less than 9 months after the funds were made available, 910 communities have made application for these grants and 288 applications have been fully processed and approved in a total amount of \$24,100,000. Moneys requested by the 910 applicant communities total \$84 million. So it is pretty clear that we will not be breaking faith with just a few people if we adopt this amendment, but we will be breaking faith with hundreds of towns and cities and millions of American people all over the Nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revised and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary situation, if my understanding is right, is this: We will all admit that the President—or whoever wrote it for him—did the best he could when this budget was sent to us. The Committee on Appropriations, especially the subcommittee, did the best it could, when the bill was reported out.

We have debated this bill for 6 days. It is very evident that in spite of all the efforts both of the administration, of the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittee, that there is at least a slight difference of opinion between the subcommittee, the full committee, and the members of this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. We are advised that there are at least nine amendments which were adopted on which there will be a rollcall in the House. It is my present intent to ask for a rollcall on all amendments if that is to be the procedure on the part of the majority.

This being the situation it would seem that it is about time to let the Committee on Appropriations take another look before we have a rollcall on these nine or all amendments.

The amendment which I offered here in the committee to permit a return of the bill to the committee in the hope we might get the best possible bill was ruled out of order. In order to get an opportunity to recommit with instructions sending the bill back to the committee and asking the committee to report within 5 days, giving the committee an opportunity to reconcile its thought with the thought which the House has expressed here by the adoption of these amendments, it is necessary to strike the enacting clause of the bill, go back to the House, and then in the House offer the motion to recommit with instructions. Unless the committee now strikes the enacting clause, the first order of business when we go back into the House will be to vote at least 9 times on rollcalls. A vote on amendments will be the first order of business—unless the enacting clause is stricken now. We will not

get an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit until after the rollcall has been had either 8 or 9 times on amendments, unless the pending amendment is adopted.

If Members desire to give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to look over the RECORD, and read some of the arguments which have been advanced in favor of the amendments which the committee has adopted, this is the way and the only way to do it. Something was said a while ago when a similar motion was offered about someone being afraid to stand up and be counted. That statement is repudiated, not only for myself, but I think I can safely say for the majority if not all the Members of the House. That was a charge of being cowardly. There was no justification for it. Is not this proposal the sensible way to get the best possible bill? Give the Committee on Appropriations—it does not claim to be perfect—an opportunity to read the RECORD and consider the will of the House, then come back within 5 days with a bill which would at the worst, be an attempt to reconcile in major part the differences of opinion which admittedly exist and let the House vote on a compromise which will give the best bill possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 20, noes 103.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. FORAND, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Smith amendment, page 3, line 2; I ask for a separate vote on the Budge amendment page 4, line 18; I ask for a separate vote on the Smith amendment, page 5, line 8; I ask for a separate vote on the Murray amendment, page 11, line 7; I ask for a separate vote on the Andersen amend-

ment on page 11, line 12; I ask for a separate vote on the Hébert amendment, page 11, lines 23 and 24; I ask for a separate vote on the Jonas amendment, page 13, line 7; I ask for a separate vote on the Dorn amendment, page 19, line 15; and a separate vote on the Fisher amendment, page 25, lines 1 to 4.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on every amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AUGUST J. STRIGGA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2046) for the relief of August J. Strigga, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, and page 2, line 1, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, but for the information of the House, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts if these amendments have been agreed to by the minority members of the committee.

Mr. LANE. They have.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOHN WILLIAM BRENNAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1863) for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "Senior" insert ": Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES L. BOSTWICK

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3322) for the relief of James L. Bostwick, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "1955" over to and including "\$1,000" in line 5 on page 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request previously made to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MURRAY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION, RECONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT OF CENTRAL PORTION OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL

(Mr. RAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the House, in conducting its own affairs, set an example in the way of reducing expenditures and the drain upon the Treasury which comes with expenditures. The plans for extending the Capitol Building and for a new House Office Building and for remodeling existing buildings fall in that category. These two projects will run to about \$100 million before completion. I am introducing two resolutions today in an effort to obtain prompt study and report by committees consisting of members who have not heretofore been involved in those plans as to whether or not the two projects can be deferred. The amounts appropriated thus far and the

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 5, 1957
For actions of April 4, 1957
85th-1st, No. 59

CONTENTS

Accounting.....41	Farm program.....12	Monopolies.....27
Adjournment.....24	Flood control.....18	Poultry.....14,23
Appropriations.....1,7,44	Flood insurance.....18	Property.....42
Assistant Secretary.....37	Food and drug.....1	Reclamation.....7
Budget.....8,28	Food, surplus.....2	Reorganization.....5,39
Corn.....15,23	Foreign aid.....10	Small business.....4,22,38
Cotton.....31	Forestry.....6	Soil bank.....15,33
Dairy.....40	Freight rates.....21	Soil conservation.....32
Deferred grazing.....11,23	Housing.....45	Sugar.....17
Depressed areas.....3,20,26	Humane slaughter.....30	Tariff.....9
Disaster relief.....34	Insect control.....43	Trade, foreign.....9,35
Drought relief.....11,23	Lands.....7,42	Transportation.....21,29
Electrification.....16,36	Legislative program...7,23	Vehicles.....19
Export-Import Bank.....7	Meatpacking.....13	Water, pollution.....1
Farm credit.....25	Minerals.....6	resources.....36

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to provide Jt. Committee on Budget. Sens. Ellender and Humphrey criticized Secretary's speech before Republican Women's Conference. Sen. Watkins urged transfer of certain Packers-Stockyards work from USDA to FTC. Senate committee reported deferred grazing bill. Sen. Humphrey urged sending surplus food to Poland. Senate received President's message recommending U. S. membership in CTC. House passed Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Sen. McClellan introduced and discussed bill to extend time for submission of reorganization plans. Sens. Morse and Neuberger introduced and Sen. Morse discussed bills to provide emergency loans to certain orchardists. Sen. Byrd submitted and discussed resolution for consolidation of appropriations bills.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 4614-29, A2724, A2725-26). On roll call votes rejected 130-285, an amendment to reduce from \$9,300,000 to \$7,973,000 funds for the Food and Drug Administration (p. 4621); and rejected, 185 to 231, an amendment to strike out \$50,000,000 for grants to States for waste treatment works construction under the Water Pollution Control Act (pp. 4622-23).

Began debate on H.R. 6500, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 4629-30

The Appropriations Committee received permission until midnight today, Apr. 5, to file a report on the 1958 Commerce Department appropriation bill. p. 4614

2. SURPLUS FOODS. Rep. Philbin stated that he understood that the U. S. was now considering arrangements for sending surplus foods to Poland, and urged that we do so. pp. 4631-32
3. DEPRESSED AREAS. Rep. Hale urged the passage of legislation for Federal assistance to depressed areas, and pointed out the need for such assistance in Maine. p. 4632

4. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Griffiths spoke in favor of additional Federal assistance to small businesses. p. 4636
5. ORGANIZATION. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau a proposed bill "to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended"; to Government Operations Committees. pp. 4517, 4637
6. FORESTRY; MINERALS. Both Houses received an Alaska Legislature memorial requesting that no more wilderness areas or other withdrawals be made of known mineralized sections of Alaska which would place these lands within the scope of such proposed national wilderness preservation system. pp. 4519, 4638
7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the next order of business is consideration of the D. C. appropriation bill, to be followed next week by consideration of the Commerce Department appropriation bill, extension of the Export-Import Bank Act, amendment of the Small Reclamation Projects Act, and the military land withdrawals bill. pp. 4629, 4630

SENATE

8. BUDGETING. Passed with an amendment by Sen. Mansfield to delete the requirement that agency submissions might be made on an annual accrued expenditure basis, S. 1585, to provide for a Joint Committee on the Budget. Sen. Mansfield inserted a statement by Sen. Kennedy on the deletion.
Received a N. Mex. Legislature resolution requesting Congress to propose a Constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. p. 4518
Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution opposing reductions in expenditures for farm relief, conservation, and other items. p. 4522
Sen. Robertson discussed Congressional control over the purse, and inserted a tabulation of the authorization balances carried forward for expenditures in fiscal 1958. pp. 4553-5
Sen. Thurmond inserted a letter from a S. C. High School favoring budget reductions, and urged the Senate to cut nonessential spending. p. 4589
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the President a message recommending legislation to authorize U. S. membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (H. Doc. 146); to Finance Committee. pp. 4511-12
Both Houses received from the Commerce Dept. a proposed bill to authorize membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. pp. 4517, 4637
Received a Nev. Legislature resolution urging Congress to return to tariff adjustment based on protection. pp. 4517-18
10. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey urged sending surplus food to Poland, and inserted an excerpt from the President's press conference, and two editorials favoring help to Poland. pp. 4543-9
Sen. Javits inserted a petition from the American Order of Gen. Pulaski, favoring aid to Poland. p. 4522
11. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 511, to establish a deferred grazing and a protein feed program to aid drought-stricken areas (S. Rept. 206). p. 4522
12. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Ellender criticized a speech by the Secretary before the Republican Women's Conference and administration of the farm program. pp. 4574-82, 4602-11

twice, in effect—once in the executive department and again on Capitol Hill.

Or take the case of the Symington subcommittee report, issued last February. During its investigation, the subcommittee received some testimony which could not be made public for security reasons, including intelligence information from the Central Intelligence Agency and other sources. In addition, much supplemental intelligence material was requested, obtained, and inserted in the subcommittee record. The latest such material was received by the committee in November, and presumably it reflected the latest estimates.

Yet, in response to our query, a subcommittee staff member told us: "None of the unpublished testimony and none of the other material supplied during or after the hearings was such as to merit any change in the report."

In other words, although the newest intelligence revisions had been made available to the subcommittee, the majority found nothing in them to cause it to revise its gloomy picture of the relative airpower strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union.

In summary then, one must place the revised estimates in balance by remembering that:

They are temporary in nature, and apply only over the next 2 years.

They represent only a fraction of overall Soviet strength.

They have already been reflected in the present budget.

We trust that the Congress will weigh these factors carefully in their current examination of the Air Force budget.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being pursuant to the order previously entered, to Monday, April 8, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 4, 1957:

UNITED NATIONS

Donald Vaughn Lowe, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

IN THE ARMY

TO BE COLONELS

Friedersdorff, Louis C., O15732.
Nemo, Ralph, O8362.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294 as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, title 10, United States

Code, section 3291, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress, title 10, United States Code, section 3311, title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Distelhorst, Frederick W., DC, O4022419.
Dixon, Leon M., Jr., MC, O468320.
Edwards, Ian K., MC, O2267482.
Ford, George W., MC, O1941874.
Hanson, Merrill H., DC, O4050928.
Hanson, Thomas A., MC, O1891967.
Lamson, Thomas H., MC, O975561.
Lipscomb, James Watts, MC.
Mansfield, John O., MC, O4016515.
Monahan, James L., DC, O938692.
Nakagawa, Bunzo, MC, O1923107.
Rose, Lawrence R., MC, O4067286.
Shamburek, Roland H., MC, O4016792.
Turner, Guthrie L., Jr., MC, O2269024.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Adams, Charles R., Jr., JAGC, O2280046.
Bogrette, Ann, AMSC, M2994.
Brown, Eleanor N., ANC, N901344.
Butcher, Anna M., ANC, N901175.
Church, Roy S., MSC, O1918954.
Conley, Paul J., MC.
Cooper, Robbie F., ANC, N900237.
del Valle-Garcia, Rafael A., MC, O2034117.
Doyle, Thomas M., MSC, O1922527.
Fitch, Charles T., MC.
Forest, Philip E., MSC, O1893890.
Futoran, Jack M., MC.
Griffin, Robert E., MSC, O4005204.
Helmann, Eleanor M., ANC, N805421.
Hettinger, Dale A., DC, O4043832.
Hille, Robert A., MSC, O4020833.
Howlett, Byron P., Jr., MSC, O1933640.
Jan, Lloyd V., MSC, O1933746.
Johnson, Merlyn B., DC.
Kellert, Albert J., MC, O4022333.
Kiel, Richard A., MSC, O1893902.
Kirchner, Marvin M., MC, O4056269.
Lau, Bennett M. K., MC, O4051019.
Little, Earle E., Jr., MC.
Marill, Irwin H., MC, O4034538.
Matthews, Nancy L., AMSC, M20006.
Mendez, Enrique, Jr., MC, O4055405.
Middleton, Gordon K., Jr., MC.
Munoz-Noya, Orlando, DC, O2276571.
Nishikawa, Wallace Y., MC, O4051120.
Pelham, Walter L., MC.
Pound, Edwin C., Jr., MC, O4043783.
Pratt, Curtiss R., MC, O4051090.
Radentz, William H., DC, O2274487.
Ross, Don R., MSC, O4007162.
Sadler, Tom H., MSC, O2272296.
Schiele, Raymond J., DC, O2276563.
Smith, Elizabeth R., Jr., WAC, L1010476.
Theodoroff, Mary J., WAC, L1020648.
Vickers, Russell E., JAGC, O2273140.
Waters, Ethel D., WAC, L1010639.
Williams, Dana S., MC, O2274744.
Winfield, Mark E., MC, O1341842.
Wolcott, Jeane M., WAC, L1020060.
Yamamoto, Hiroshi, MSC, O4006713.
Yarbrough, Roy D., MSC, O2206298.
Zone, Robert M., MC, O4087979.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Bullard, John W., MSC, O4030646.
Erickson, Duane G., MSC, O4030113.
Gray, Barbara D., AMSC, M3037.
Latta, Patricia A., AMSC, M3024.
Read, Betty I., WAC, L1010826.
Silvernale, Douglas J., MSC, O4029627.
Stover, James W., MSC, O4019402.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Franklin, Swayne B., O1688769.
Phillips, Eric C., O1181082.
White, Kent B., O404333.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Baker, Theodore A., O1917897.
McDonald, Payton R., Jr., O4023600.
Stenquist, Richard W., O1341054.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Kelley, Emmett L., Jr., O4031400.
Komarow, Ronald M., O4040301.
McCustion, Alan L., O4010737.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294 as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, subject to completion of internship:

Farbstein, Martin E.
Leonard, John T.
Spees, Everett K., Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Oswalt, Harris G.
Browning, Robert D.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Adams, James E.	London, William G.
Baker, Jerry W.	McFarland, Roger E.
Banner, Thomas A.	McGarvey, Bruce H.
Bell, Ross T., Jr.	Mettam, Richard E.
Berg, George A.	Nelson, Clifford R.
Carpenter, Rodney K.	Nemeth, Philip K.
Cockrell, Allen A., Jr.	Nestle, Eugene C.
Cothran, Paul E.	Nichols, Charles W.
Coull, James M.	Noyer, Gary R.
Crawford, Jack F.	Parrack, Jim M., Jr.
Davies, Peter G.,	Paulus, Lawrence R.
O4077302	Philpott, Lawrence D.,
Desonier, Richard J.	O4060575
Echols, Bill D.	Pinnell, Aubrey B., Jr.
Fleming, Jerry L.	Plummer, Gerrell V.
Forgy, Jack O.	Polk, John C.
Gagliardone, John L.	Pople, Richard A.
George, Edward H., III	Porter, Bobby B.
Gonzales, Richard E.,	Rafferty, James E.
Jr., O4072259	Rich, Arthur L., Jr.
Grant, Arthur J., Jr.	Robbins, Grant C.
Grimes, Dan S.	Rock, Thomas L.
Harris, Chester R., Jr.	Simpson, William F., Jr.
Harris, Thomas L., Jr.	Sones, Vernon B.
Harvard, Thomas P.,	Stoll, Roy M.
Jr.	Thorne, Gerald B.
Hempling, Ray D.	Trdla, Joseph R.
Hofe, Kenneth W.	Turk, Roy M.
Hutchison, Jack R.	Wharton, Walter N.
Hyde, Herbert K., Jr.,	Whatley, Howard G.,
O4048492	O4062241
Isbell, James C.	Williams, Edward H.
Jones, Walter R.	Williams, William J.,
Kruger, Robert	Jr.
Leos, Tommy G.	Zimmerman, Robert
Logan, Laddie B.	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 4, 1957:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Scovel Richardson, of Missouri; to be judge, United States Customs Court.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our fathers and all their succeeding generations we rejoice that our loftiest aspirations and deepest longings find their source and their supply in Thee.

We pray that daily we may yield our minds and hearts in glad and grateful obedience to Thy wise and holy will.

Grant that especially during this day we may have the presence and guiding power of Thy divine spirit.

Inspire us to discharge our duties with an eye single to Thy glory and be worthy of receiving the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I offered an amendment to the pending bill on page 33, line 2. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 4492 shows that amendment to have been rejected whereas, in fact, it was agreed to. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho? There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1958.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER reserved all points of order.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR STANDARDS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor Standards of the House Committee on Education and Labor may sit tomorrow, if necessary, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL- FARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Separate votes having been demanded on all amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, the Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "\$1,510,000" in line 11 and "\$200,000" in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,480,000" in line 11 and "\$170,000" in line 12.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 126, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—286

Abbott	Byrne, Ill.	Fountain
Abernethy	Byrnes, Wis.	Frazier
Adair	Cannon	Gary
Alexander	Carrigg	Gathings
Alger	Cederberg	Gavin
Allen, Calif.	Chamberlain	George
Allen, Ill.	Chelf	Grant
Andersen,	Chenoweth	Griffin
H. Carl	Chiperfield	Gross
Andrews	Church	Gubser
Arends	Clevenger	Gwinn
Ashmore	Coad	Hale
Auchincloss	Cole	Haley
Avery	Collier	Halleck
Ayres	Colmer	Harden
Baker	Cooper	Hardy
Baldwin	Corbett	Harris
Barden	Coudert	Harrison, Nebr.
Baring	Cramer	Harrison, Va.
Bass, N. H.	Cunningham,	Harvey
Eass, Tenn.	Iowa	Hays, Ohio
Bates	Cunningham,	Hébert
Baumhart	Nebr.	Hemphill
Beamer	Curtin	Henderson
Becker	Curtis, Mass.	Herlong
Beckworth	Curtis, Mo.	Heselson
Belcher	Dague	Hess
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Ga.	Hiestand
Bennett, Mich.	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Bentley	Dempsey	Hillings
Berry	Dennison	Hoeven
Betts	Derounian	Hoffman
Blitch	Devereux	Holmes
Boggs	Dixon	Holt
Boland	Dooley	Horan
Belton	Dorn, N. Y.	Hosmer
Bonner	Dorn, S. C.	Huddleston
Bosch	Dowdy	Hyde
Bow	Durham	Ikard
Boykin	Edmondson	Jackson
Breeding	Engle	James
Brooks, La.	Evins	Jarman
Brooks, Tex.	Fallon	Jenkins
Brown, Ga.	Fascell	Jennings
Brown, Mo.	Feighan	Jensen
Brown, Ohio	Felton	Johansen
Brownson	Fino	Johnson
Broyhill	Fisher	Jonas
Budge	Flynt	Jones, Mo.
Burleson	Ford	Judd
Bush	Forrester	Kean

Kearney	Norblad	Smith, Miss.
Keating	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Va.
Keeney	O'Hara, Minn.	Smith, Wis.
Kilburn	Osmer	Springer
Kilday	Ostertag	Stauffer
Kilgore	Patman	Steed
Kitchin	Pelly	Taber
Knox	Pfost	Talle
Krueger	Pillion	Taylor
Laird	Poage	Teague, Calif.
Landrum	Poff	Tewes
Lane	Prouty	Thomas
Latham	Ray	Thompson, La.
LeCompte	Reed	Thompson, Tex.
Lennon	Rees, Kans.	Thomson, Wyo.
Lipscomb	Reuss	Thornberry
Loser	Rhodes, Ariz.	Tollefson
McCulloch	Riehlman	Trimble
McDonough	Riley	Tuck
McGregor	Rivers	Udall
McIntire	Roberts	Utt
McIntosh	Robeson, Va.	Vanik
McMillan	Robson, Ky.	Van Pelt
McVey	Rogers, Colo.	Vorys
Macdonald	Rogers, Fla.	Vursell
Mack, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.	Wainwright
Magnuson	Rogers, Tex.	Watts
Mahon	Rutherford	Weaver
Mailliard	Sadlak	Westland
Martin	St. George	Wharton
Mason	Schenck	Whitener
Matthews	Scherer	Whitten
Meador	Schwengel	Widnall
Michel	Scott, N. C.	Wigglesworth
Miller, Md.	Scott, Pa.	Williams, Miss.
Miller, Nebr.	Scrivner	Williams, N. Y.
Miller, N. Y.	Scudder	Willis
Mills	Selden	Wilson, Calif.
Minshall	Shuford	Wilson, Ind.
Morrison	Sikes	Winstead
Moss	Siler	Wright
Mumma	Simpson, Ill.	Yates
Murray	Simpson, Pa.	Young
Neal	Sisk	Younger
Nicholson	Smith, Calif.	
Nimtz	Smith, Kans.	

NAYS—126

Addonizio	Green, Oreg.	Multer
Albert	Griffiths,	Natcher
Anfuso	Hagen	Norrell
Ashley	Haskell	O'Brien, Ill.
Bailey	Hays, Ark.	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett	Healey	O'Konski
Blatnik	Holfield	O'Neill
Bolling	Holland	Passman
Boyle	Hull	Patterson
Bray	Jones, Ala.	Perkins
Broomfield	Karsten	Philbin
Buckley	Kearns	Pilcher
Burdick	Kee	Polk
Byrd	Kelley, Pa.	Porter
Canfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Preston
Carnahan	Keogh	Price
Celler	King	Rabaut
Christopher	Kirwan	Radwan
Chudoff	Kluczynski	Rains
Coffin	Knutson	Rhodes, Pa.
Cooley	Lanham	Rodino
Dawson, Ill.	Lankford	Rooney
Delaney	Lesinski	Santangelo
Dellay	Long	Saund
Denton	McCarthy	Saylor
Dingell	McConnell	Seely-Brown
Dollinger	McCormack	Shelley
Donohue	McFall	Sheppard
Doyle	McGovern	Spence
Dwyer	Machrowicz	Staggers
Eberhart	Mack, Ill.	Sullivan
Elliott	Madden	Teague, Tex.
Farbstein	Marshall	Teller
Flood	May	Thompson, N. J.
Fogarty	Merrrow	Ullman
Forand	Metcalfe	Van Zandt
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Friedel	Moore	Wier
Garmatz	Morano	Withrow
Gordon	Morgan	Wolverton
Granahan	Morris	Zablocki
Gray	Moulder	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson, Cretella
Mont. Davis, Tenn.
Andresen, Dies
August H. Diggs
Aspinall, Fulton
Bowler, Green, Pa.
Byrne, Pa. Gregory
Clark Holtzman

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Walter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. ANFUSO changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 9, strike out "\$2,225,000" and insert "\$2,021,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 171, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—241

Abbitt	Chipperfield	Haskell
Adair	Church	Hays, Ark.
Alexander	Clevenger	Hays, Ohio
Alger	Cole	Hébert
Allen, Calif.	Collier	Hemphill
Allen, Ill.	Colmer	Henderson
Andersen, H. Carl	Cooper	Herlong
Arends	Coudert	Hess
Ashmore	Cramer	Hiestand
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mass.	Hill
Avery	Curtis, Mo.	Hillings
Ayres	Dague	Hoeven
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Hoffman
Barden	Dawson, Utah	Holt
Bass, N. H.	Dennison	Hosmer
Bass, Tenn.	Derounian	Huddleston
Bates	Devereux	Hull
Baumhart	Dixon	Hyde
Beamer	Dooley	Ikard
Becker	Dorn, N. Y.	Jackson
Beckworth	Dorn, S. C.	James
Belcher	Dowdy	Jenkins
Bennett, Fla.	Durham	Jennings
Bentley	Evins	Jensen
Berry	Fallon	Johansen
Betts	Fasceil	Jonas
Blich	Fisher	Jones, Mo.
Bolton	Flynt	Kearney
Bonner	Ford	Keating
Bosch	Forrester	Keeney
Bow	Fountain	Kilburn
Brooks, La.	Frazier	Kilday
Brooks, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	Kilgore
Brown, Ohio	Gary	Kitchin
Brownson	Gathings	Knox
Broyhill	George	Krueger
Buckley	Grant	Lalrd
Budge	Gross	Landrum
Burleson	Gubser	Latham
Bush	Gwinn	LeCompte
Byrne, Ill.	Hale	Lennon
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Lipscomb
Cannon	Harden	Loser
Cederberg	Hardy	McConnell
Chamberlain	Harris	McCulloch
Chelf	Harrison, Nebr.	McDonough
Chenoweth	Harrison, Va.	McGregor
	Harvey	McIntire

McMillan	Ray	Taber
McVey	Reed	Talle
Macdonald	Rees, Kans.	Taylor
Mack, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Teague, Calif.
Mack, Wash.	Riehlman	Teague, Tex.
Mahon	Rivers	Thomas
Mailliard	Roberts	Thompson, La.
Martin	Robeson, Va.	Thompson, Tex.
Mason	Robson, Ky.	Thomson, Wyo.
Matthews	Rogers, Colo.	Thornberry
Meador	Rogers, Fla.	Tuck
Merrrow	Rogers, Mass.	Utt
Michel	Rogers, Tex.	Van Pelt
Miller, Md.	Rutherford	Vorys
Miller, Nebr.	St. George	Vursell
Miller, N. Y.	Schenck	Wainwright
Mills	Scherer	Weaver
Minshall	Scott, N. C.	Westland
Mumma	Scrivner	Wharton
Murray	Scudder	Whitener
Neal	Selden	Whitten
Nicholson	Shuford	Widnall
Nimtz	Sikes	Wigglesworth
Norblad	Siler	Williams, Miss.
Norrell	Simpson, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
O'Hara, Minn.	Simpson, Pa.	Willis
Osmer	Smith, Calif.	Wilson, Calif.
Ostertag	Smith, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Pfost	Smith, Miss.	Winstead
Pillion	Smith, Va.	Wright
Poage	Smith, Wis.	Young
Poff	Springer	Younger
Prouty	Stauffer	

NAYS—171

Addonizio	Friedel	Natcher
Albert	Garmatz	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Gavin	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ashley	Gordon	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Granahan	O'Konski
Baldwin	Gray	O'Neill
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Passman
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Griffin	Patterson
Blatnik	Griffiths	Pelly
Boggs	Hagen	Perkins
Boland	Halleck	Philbin
Bolling	Healey	Pilcher
Boyle	Heslton	Polk
Bray	Hollifield	Porter
Breeding	Holland	Powell
Broomfield	Holmes	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Price
Brown, Mo.	Jarman	Rabaut
Burdick	Johnson	Radwan
Byrd	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Canfield	Judd	Reuss
Carnahan	Karsten	Rhodes, Pa.
Carrigg	Kearns	Riley
Celler	Kee	Rodino
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.	Rooney
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadiak
Clark	Keogh	Santangelo
Coad	King	Saund
Coffin	Kirwan	Saylor
Cooley	Kluczynski	Schwengel
Corbett	Knutson	Scott, Pa.
Cunningham,	Lane	Seely-Brown
Iowa	Lanham	Shelley
Cunningham,	Lankford	Sheppard
Nebr.	Lesinski	Sisk
Curtin	Long	Spence
Dawson, Ill.	McCarthy	Staggers
Delaney	McCormack	Steed
Dellay	McFall	Sullivan
Dempsey	McGovern	Teller
Denton	McIntosh	Tewes
Dingell	Machrowicz	Thompson, N. J.
Dollinger	Madden	Toilefson
Donohue	Magnuson	Trimble
Doyle	Marshall	Udall
Dwyer	May	Ullman
Eberharther	Metcalfe	Vanik
Edmondson	Miller, Calif.	Van Zandt
Elliott	Moore	Vinson
Engle	Morano	Watts
Farbstein	Morgan	Wier
Feighan	Morris	Withrow
Fenton	Morrison	Wolverton
Fino	Moss	Yates
Flood	Moulder	Zablocki
Fogarty	Multer	Zelenko
Forand		

NOT VOTING—20

Abernethy	Boykin	Holtzman
Anderson,	Byrne, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.
Mont.	Cretella	Roosevelt
Andresen,	Davis, Tenn.	Sheehan
August H.	Dies	Sieminski
Andrews	Diggs	Walter
Aspinall	Fulton	
Bowler	Gregory	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. BRAY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FINO changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 7, strike out "\$1,031,300" and insert "\$985,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 169, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—246

Abbitt	Collier	Ikard
Abernethy	Cooley	Jackson
Adair	Cooper	James
Addonizio	Coudert	Jarman
Alexander	Cramer	Jenkins
Alger	Curtis, Mo.	Jennings
Allen, Calif.	Dague	Jensen
Allen, Ill.	Davis, Ga.	Johansen
Andersen, H. Carl	Dawson, Utah	Johnson
Andrews	Dempsey	Jonas
Arends	Derounian	Jones, Mo.
Ashley	Devereux	Kearney
Ashmore	Dixon	Keating
Avery	Dooley	Keeney
Ayres	Dorn, S. C.	Kilburn
Baker	Dowdy	Kilday
Barden	Durham	Kilgore
Bass, N. H.	Engle	Kirwan
Bass, Tenn.	Evins	Kitchin
Bates	Fallon	Kluczynski
Beamer	Fisher	Krueger
Becker	Flynt	Lalrd
Beckworth	Ford	Landrum
Belcher	Forrester	Lane
Bennett, Fla.	Fountain	Latham
Bentley	Frazier	LeCompte
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Lennon
Betts	Gary	Lipscomb
Blich	Gathings	Loser
Bolton	Grant	McCulloch
Bonner	Gross	McDonough
Bosch	Gubser	McGregor
Bow	Gwinn	McIntire
Brooks, La.	Haie	McMillan
Brooks, Tex.	Haley	McVey
Brown, Ga.	Halleck	Macdonald
Brown, Ohio	Harden	Mack, Wash.
Brownson	Hardy	Magnuson
Broyhill	Harris	Mahon
Budge	Harrison, Nebr.	Mailliard
Burleson	Harrison, Va.	Martin
Byrne, Ill.	Harvey	Mason
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays, Ark.	Meador
Cannon	Hays, Ohio	Merrrow
Cederberg	Hébert	Michel
Chamberlain	Hemphill	Miller, Md.
Chelf	Henderson	Miller, Nebr.
Chenoweth	Herlong	Miller, N. Y.
	Hess	Mills
	Hiestand	Minshall
	Hill	Morrison
	Hillings	Mumma
	Hoeven	Murray
	Hoffman	Neal
	Horan	Nicholson
	Hosmer	Nimtz
	Huddleston	Norblad

O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
Ostertag
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Ray
Reed
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robson, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Scott, N. C.
Scrivner
Scudder

Selden
Sheehan
Sheppard
Shuford
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stauffer
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tewes
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry

Trimble
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Watts
Weaver
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—169

Albert
Anfuso
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Baumhart
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Boiton
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Mo.
Buckley
Burdick
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Christopher
Chudoff
Coad
Coffin
Corbett
Cunningham,
Iowa
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Dellay
Dennison
Denton
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Doyle
Dwyer
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Forand

Friedel
Garmatz
Gavin
George
Gordon
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen
Haskell
Healey
Heseltan
Holifield
Holland
Holmes
Holt
Hull
Hyde
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
King
Knox
Knutson
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McFall
McGovern
McIntosh
McMillan
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Marshall
Matthews
May
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Moore
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Moulder

Multer
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Polk
Porter
Powell
Preston
Price
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scott, Pa.
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sikes
Sisk
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Steed
Sullivan
Teller
Tewes
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Westland
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson,
Mont.
Andresen,
August H.
Aspinall
Bowler
Boykin

Colmer
Cretella
Davis, Tenn.
Dies
Diggs
Fulton
Gregory

Holtzman
Reece, Tenn.
Roosevelt
Sieminski
Walter

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. BOYLE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and Mr. GEORGE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I was in the hall outside when my name was called. Do I qualify?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman was in the room listening when his name was called.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 18, strike out "\$542,000" and insert: "\$406,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 137, nays 275, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—137

Abbitt
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andrews
Arends
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Barden
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Becker
Belcher
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bosch
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burlison
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Clevenger
Cole
Colmer
Cramer
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Utah
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon

Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Gary
Gathings
Gross
Gwinn
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Harrison, Nebr.
Hebert
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hoffman
Hosmer
Jackson
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kean
Kearney
Keeney
Kilburn
Kilgore
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Latham
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Mason
Meador
Michel

Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Minshall
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Ray
Reed
Robeson, Va.
Robson, Ky.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Scrivner
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Wharton
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

NAYS—275

Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Anfuso
Ashley
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beamer
Beckworth

Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Boyle
Bray
Breeding
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Brown, Ga.

Brown, Mo.
Buckley
Burdick
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Chelf
Christopher
Chudoff
Church

Clark
Coad
Coffin
Collier
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cunningham,
Iowa
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Dellay
Dempsey
Dennison
Denton
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn, N. Y.
Doyle
Durham
Dwyer
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gavin
George
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Haskell
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hemphill
Heseltan
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Holmes
Holt
Horan
Huddleston

Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Kitchen
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
LeCompte
Lennon
Lesinski
Long
Loser
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McFall
McGovern
McIntire
McIntosh
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
May
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Moore
Morano
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Natcher
Nimtz
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost

Philbin
Pilcher
Polk
Porter
Powell
Preston
Price
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scott, Pa.
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Shuford
Sikes
Sisk
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Tewes
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Watts
Westland
Whitener
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson,
Mont.
Andresen,
August H.
Aspinall
Bowler
Boykin
Cretella

Davis, Tenn.
Dies
Diggs
Gregory
Holtzman
James
Reece, Tenn.
Sieminski

Smith, Miss.
Walter
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. James.

Mr. Bowler with August H. Andresen.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. SHEEHAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HARVEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 8, strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$5,558,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 205, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—214

Abbitt	Forrester	Mills
Abernethy	Fountain	Minshall
Adair	Frazier	Mumma
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Murray
Alger	Gary	Neal
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Gross	Norblad
Andersen,	Gwinn	Norrell
H. Carl	Ha'e	O'Hara, Minn.
Andrews	Haley	Ostertag
Ashmore	Harden	Pillion
Auchincloss	Hardy	Poff
Avery	Harris	Ray
Ayres	Harrison, Nebr.	Rcccd
Baker	Harrison, Va.	Rees, Kans.
Barden	Harvey	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass, N. H.	Hébert	Riehlman
Bass, Tenn.	Hemphill	Rivers
Bates	Henderson	Robeson, Va.
Baumhart	Herlong	Robson, Ky.
Beamer	Hess	Rogers, Fla.
Becker	Hiestand	Rogers, Tex.
Belcher	Hill	Rutherford
Bennett, Fla.	Hillings	Sadlak
Bentley	Hoeven	St. George
Berry	Hoffman	Schenck
Betts	Holt	Scherer
Blitch	Hyde	Schwengel
Bonner	Ikard	Scott, N. C.
Bosch	Jackson	Scrivner
Bow	James	Scudder
Brooks, La.	Jenkins	Selden
Brown, Ohio	Jensen	Sheehan
Brownson	Johansen	Shuford
Broyhill	Jonas	Sikes
Budge	Jones, Mo.	Siler
Burleson	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Byrne, Ill.	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Keating	Smith, Calif.
Cannon	Keeney	Smith, Kans.
Cederberg	Kilburn	Smith, Miss.
Chamberlain	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Chelf	Kilgore	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth	Kitchin	Stauffer
Chiperfield	Krueger	Taber
Church	Laird	Talle
Clevenger	Landrum	Taylor
Cole	Latham	Teague, Calif.
Collier	LeCompte	Tewes
Colmer	Lennon	Thomas
Cooper	Lipscomb	Thompson, La.
Coudert	Loser	Thompson, Tex.
Cramer	McConnell	Thomson, Wyo.
Cunningham,	McCulloch	Tuck
Iowa	McDonough	Utt
Curtis, Mo.	McGregor	Van Pelt
Dague	McIntire	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	McIntosh	Wainwright
Dennison	McMillan	Weaver
Derounian	McVey	Westland
Devereux	Mahon	Wharton
Dooley	Maillard	Whitener
Dorn, N. Y.	Martin	Whitten
Dorn, S. C.	Mason	Wigglesworth
Dowdy	Matthews	Williams, Miss.
Evins	May	Williams, N. Y.
Fallon	Meador	Willis
Fascell	Morrow	Wilson, Ind.
Fino	Michel	Winstead
Fisher	Miller, Md.	Wright
Flynt	Miller, Nebr.	Young
Ford	Miller, N. Y.	Younger

NAYS—205

Addonizio	Garmatz	Nimtz
Albert	Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	George	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Gordon	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley	Granahan	O'Konski
Bailey	Grant	O'Neill
Baldwin	Gray	Osmer
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Passman
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Patman
Beckworth	Griffin	Patterson
Bennett, Mich.	Griffiths	Pelly
Blatnik	Gubser	Perkins
Boggs	Hagen	Pfost
Boland	Halleck	Philbin
Bolling	Haskell	Pilcher
Bolton	Hays, Ark.	Poage
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Boyle	Healey	Porter
Bray	Heseltan	Powell
Breeding	Holfield	Preston
Brooks, Tex.	Holland	Price
Broomfield	Holmes	Prouty
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Rabaut
Brown, Mo.	Hosmer	Radwan
Buckley	Huddleston	Rains
Burdick	Hull	Reuss
Bush	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrd	Jennings	Riley
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson	Roberts
Canfield	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Carnahan	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Carrigg	Karsten	Rogers, Mass.
Celler	Kearns	Rooney
Christopher	Kee	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Santangelo
Clark	Kelly, N. Y.	Saund
Coad	Keogh	Saylor
Coffin	King	Scott, Pa.
Cooley	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Corbett	Kluczynski	Shelley
Cunningham,	Knox	Sheppard
Nebr.	Knutson	Sisk
Curtin	Lane	Spence
Curtis, Mass.	Lanham	Springer
Dawson, Ill.	Lankford	Staggers
Dawson, Utah	Lesinski	Steed
Delaney	Long	Sullivan
Dellay	McCarthy	Teague, Tex.
Dempsey	McCormack	Teller
Denton	McFall	Thompson, N. J.
Dingell	McGovern	Thornberry
Dixon	Macdonald	Tollefson
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Trimble
Donohue	Mack, Ill.	Udall
Doyle	Mack, Wash.	Ullman
Durham	Madden	Vanik
Dwyer	Magnuson	Van Zandt
Eberharter	Marshall	Vinson
Edmondson	Metcalf	Vorys
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Engle	Moore	Widnall
Farbstein	Morano	Wier
Feighan	Morgan	Wilson, Calif.
Fenton	Morris	Withrow
Flood	Morrison	Wolverton
Fogarty	Moss	Yates
Forand	Moulder	Zablocki
Friedel	Multer	Zelenko
Fulton	Natcher	

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson,	Bowler	Gregory
Mont.	Cretella	Holtzman
Andersen,	Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.
August H.	Dies	Sieminski
Aspinall	Diggs	Walter

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. August H. Andersen of Minnesota for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. BUSH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 5, strike out "\$262,000,000" and insert "\$249,814,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 200, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—220

Abbitt	Flynt	Miller, Nebr.
Abernethy	Ford	Miller, N. Y.
Adair	Forrester	Mills
Alger	Fountain	Minshall
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Mumma
Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Murray
Andersen,	George	Neal
H. Carl	Gross	Nicholson
Andrews	Gubser	Nimtz
Arends	Gwinn	Norblad
Ashmore	Ha'e	O'Hara, Minn.
Auchincloss	Halcy	Osmer
Ayres	Halleck	Ostertag
Baker	Harden	Pelly
Barden	Hardy	Pillion
Bass, N. H.	Harris	Poage
Bates	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Baumhart	Harrison, Va.	Prouty
Beamer	Harvey	Ray
Becker	Hébert	Reed
Belcher	Hemphill	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Fla.	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bentley	Herlong	Riehlman
Berry	Heseltan	Robeson, Va.
Betts	Hess	Robson, Ky.
Blitch	Hiestand	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Hill	Rutherford
Bolton	Hoeven	St. George
Bonner	Hoffman	Schenck
Bosch	Holt	Scherer
Bow	Horan	Schwengel
Boyle	Hosmer	Scott, N. C.
Bray	Hosmer	Scrivner
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Scudder
Brown, Ohio	Jackson	Sheehan
Brownson	James	Shuford
Broyhill	Jenkins	Siler
Budge	Jennings	Simpson, Ill.
Burleson	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Bush	Johansen	Smith, Calif.
Byrne, Ill.	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Cannon	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Cederberg	Kearney	Springer
Chamberlain	Keating	Stauffer
Chenoweth	Keeney	Taber
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Talle
Church	Kilday	Teague, Calif.
Clevenger	Kilgore	Teague, Tex.
Cole	Kitchin	Tewes
Collier	Knox	Thomas
Colmer	Krueger	Thompson, La.
Cooley	Laird	Thompson, Tex.
Corbett	Lankford	Thomson, Wyo.
Coudert	Latham	Thornberry
Cramer	LeCompte	Tuck
Cunningham,	Lennon	Utt
Iowa	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Curtin	McGregor	Vursell
Curtis, Mass.	McConnell	Wainwright
Dague	McCulloch	Weaver
Davis, Ga.	McDonough	Westland
Derounian	McIntire	Wharton
Devereux	McMillan	Whitener
Dixon	McVey	Widnall
Dooley	Mack, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Wash.	Williams, Miss.
Dorn, S. C.	Mahon	Williams, N. Y.
Dowdy	Maillard	Willis
Durham	Martin	Wilson, Calif.
Fallon	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Fino	Meador	Winstead
Fisher	Michel	Wright
	Miller, Md.	Younger

NAYS—200

Addonizio	Barrett	Brooks, Tex.
Albert	Bass, Tenn.	Broomfield
Alexander	Beckworth	Brown, Ga.
Anfuso	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Mo.
Ashley	Blatnik	Buckley
Avery	Boland	Burdick
Bailey	Bolling	Byrd
Baldwin	Boykin	Byrne, Pa.
Baring	Breeding	Canfield

Abblitt	Allen, Ill.	Ashmore
Abcrnethy	Andersen,	Auchincloss
Adair	H. Carl	Avery
Addonizio	Andrews	Ayres
Alexander	Anfuso	Baker
Alger	Arends	Baldwin
Allen, Calif.	Ashlev	Barden

Baring
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Buckley
Budge
Burleson
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Coad
Coffin
Cole
Collier
Colmer
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cunningham,
Iowa
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Utah
Dellay
Dempsey
Dennison
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon
Dooley
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Fenton
Fisher
Flynt
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gary
Gathings
Gavin

George
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Haskell
Haskell
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hlestand
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoeben
Hoffman
Holmes
Holt
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keeney
Kelly, N. Y.
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
Kilwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long
Loser
McCarthy
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntyre
McIntosh
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Mason
Matthews
May
Meador
Merrow
Metcalf
Michel
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Moore
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Nicholson
Nimtz
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Prouty
Rains
Ray
Reed
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robson, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
St. George
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scott, Pa.
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Sheppard
Shuford
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Steed
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tewes
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Watts
Weaver
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis

Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead

Albert
Bailey
Barrett
Blatnik
Breeding
Burdick
Byrne, Pa.
Celler
Chudoff
Cooley
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Eberharter
Farbsteln
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Garmatz
Gordon
Granahan

Anderson,
Mont.
Andresen,
August H.
Aspinall

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Mr. Anderson of Montana for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. GRANT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GARMATZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 7, strike out "\$7,470,000" and insert "\$7,124,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 217, nays 201, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—217

Abbott
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andrews
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Barden
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beamer
Becker

Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Boykin
Boyle
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burleson
Bush

Byrne, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Coffin
Collier
Colmer
Cooper
Cramer
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Utah
Derounian

NAYS—77

Green, Pa.
Griffin
Hagen
Hollifield
Holland
Horan
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Keogh
King
Knutson
Lanham
Lesinski
McCormack
McFall
McGovern
Machrowicz
Madden
Miller, Calif.
Morano
Morris
Multer
Natcher

NOT VOTING—13

Bowler
Cretella
Davis, Tenn.
Dies
Gregory

Passman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Porter
Powell
Preston
Price
Rabaut
Radwan
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rooney
Santangelo
Shelley
Sullivan
Teller
Vinson
Westland
Wier
Zablocki
Zelenko

Devereux
Dixon
Dooley
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gathings
Grant
Gray
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hale
Haley
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Haskell
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hlestand
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman
Huddleston
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kearney

Keating
Keeney
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
Kitchin
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Latham
LeCompte
Lennon
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Mahon
Mailliard
Mason
Meador
Merrow
Michel
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara, Minn.
Ostertag
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Ray
Reed
Rees, Kans.
Riehlman
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robson, Ky.
Rogers, Colo.

NAYS—201

Addonizio
Albert
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Baumhart
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bray
Breeding
Broomfield
Brown, Mo.
Buckley
Burdick
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Cooley
Corbett
Coudert
Cunningham,
Iowa
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Dellay
Dempsey
Dennison
Denton

Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Doyle
Durham
Dwyer
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Farbsteln
Feighan
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gavin
George
Gordon
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen
Halleck
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Healey
Heselton
Hollifield
Holland
Holmes
Holt
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Hyde
Jennings
Johnson
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Kearns
Kearns

Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
Sadlak
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Scott, N. C.
Scrivner
Scudder
Selden
Sheehan
Shuford
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stauffer
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tewes
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Younger

Perkins	Rooney	Thompson, N. J.
Pfost	Roosevelt	Tollefson
Pilcher	Santangelo	Trimble
Porter	Saund	Udall
Powell	Saylor	Ullman
Preston	Schwengel	Vanik
Price	Scott, Pa.	Vah Zandt
Prouty	Seely-Brown	Vinson
Rabaut	Shelley	Watts
Radwan	Sheppard	Widnall
Rains	Sisk	Wier
Reuss	Spence	Wigglesworth
Rhodes, Ariz.	Staggers	Withrow
Rhodes, Pa.	Steed	Wolverton
Riley	Sullivan	Yates
Roberts	Talle	Zablocki
Rodino	Taylor	Zelenko
Rogers, Mass.	Teller	

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson, Mont.	Cretella	Reece, Tenn.
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Tenn.	Sieminski
Aspinall	Dies	Walter
Bowler	Gregory	Wilson, Calif.
	Holtzman	
	Philbin	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. RIVERS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 12, strike out "\$462,000" and insert "\$431,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 210, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—206

Abbott	Brooks, La.	Dorn, S. C.
Abernethy	Broomfield	Dowdy
Adair	Brown, Ohio	Fallon
Alexander	Broyhill	Fascell
Alger	Budge	Fino
Allen, Calif.	Burleson	Fisher
Allen, Ill.	Bush	Flynt
Andersen, H. Carl	Byrne, Ill.	Ford
Andrews	Byrnes, Wis.	Forrester
Arends	Cannon	Frazier
Ashmore	Cederberg	Gary
Auchincloss	Chamberlain	Gathings
Avery	Chenoweth	Grant
Ayres	Chiperfield	Griffin
Baker	Church	Gross
Barden	Clevenger	Gubser
Bass, N. H.	Cole	Gwinn
Bates	Collier	Hale
Baumhart	Colmer	Haley
Beamer	Cooper	Halleck
Becker	Cramer	Harden
Belcher	Curtis, Mass.	Hardy
Bennett, Fla.	Curtis, Mo.	Harrison, Nebr.
Bentley	Dague	Harrison, Va.
Berry	Davis, Ga.	Harvey
Betts	Dawson, Utah	Hébert
Blitch	Dennison	Hemphill
Bolton	Derounian	Henderson
Bosch	Devereux	Herlong
Bow	Dixon	Hess
Boykin	Dooley	Hiestand
	Dorn, N. Y.	Hill

Hoffman	Mack, Wash.	Selden
Holt	Mahon	Sheehan
Horan	Mailliard	Shuford
Hosmer	Martin	Sikes
Huddleston	Mason	Siler
Hyde	Meader	Simpson, Ill.
Jackson	Michel	Simpson, Pa.
James	Miller, Md.	Smith, Calif.
Jenkins	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Kans.
Jennings	Miller, N. Y.	Smith, Miss.
Jensen	Minshall	Smith, Va.
Johansen	Mumma	Smith, Wis.
Jonas	Murray	Stauffer
Jones, Mo.	Neal	Taber
Kearney	Nicholson	Taylor
Keating	O'Hara, Minn.	Teague, Calif.
Keeney	Ostertag	Tewes
Kilburn	Pillion	Thomas
Kilgore	Poage	Thomson, Wyo.
Kitchin	Poff	Tuck
Knox	Prouty	Van Pelt
Krueger	Ray	Vorys
Laird	Reed	Vursell
Landrum	Rees, Kans.	Wainwright
Latham	Riehlman	Weaver
LeCompte	Rivers	Westland
Lennon	Robeson, Va.	Wharton
Lipscomb	Robson, Ky.	Whitener
Loser	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
McCulloch	Rutherford	Wigglesworth
McDonough	St. George	Williams, Miss.
McGregor	Schenck	Williams, N. Y.
McIntire	Scherer	Willis
McIntosh	Scott, N. C.	Wilson, Calif.
McMillan	Scrivner	Wilson, Ind.
McVey	Scudder	Winstead
		Younger

NAYS—210

Addonizio	Fogarty	Moore
Albert	Forand	Morano
Anfuso	Fountain	Morgan
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Morris
Bailey	Friedel	Morrison
Baldwin	Fulton	Moss
Baring	Garmatz	Moulder
Barrett	Gavin	Natcher
Bass, Tenn.	George	Nimtz
Beckworth	Gordon	Norrell
Bennett, Mich.	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Blatnik	Gray	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Ill.
Boland	Green, Pa.	O'Konski
Bolling	Griffiths	O'Neill
Bonner	Hagen	Osmer
Boyle	Harris	Passman
Bray	Haskell	Patman
Breeding	Hays, Ark.	Patterson
Brooks, Tex.	Hays, Ohio	Pelly
Brown, Ga.	Healey	Perkins
Brown, Mo.	Heseltun	Pfost
Buckley	Hoeven	Philbin
Burdick	Holifield	Pilcher
Byrd	Holland	Polk
Byrne, Pa.	Holmes	Porter
Canfield	Hull	Powell
Carnahan	Ikard	Preston
Carrigg	Jarman	Price
Celler	Johnson	Rabaut
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Radwan
Christopher	Judd	Rains
Chudoff	Karsten	Reuss
Clark	Kearns	Rhodes, Ariz.
Coad	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Coffin	Kelley, Pa.	Riley
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Roberts
Coult	Keogh	Rodino
Coudert	Kilday	Rogers, Colo.
Cunningham,	King	Rogers, Mass.
Iowa	Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.
Cunningham,	Kluczynski	Rooney
Nebr.	Knutson	Roosevelt
Curtin	Lane	Sadlak
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Santangelo
Delaney	Lankford	Saund
Dellay	Lesinski	Saylor
Dempsey	Long	Schwengel
Denton	McCarthy	Scott, Pa.
Diggs	McConnell	Seely-Brown
Dingell	McCormack	Shelley
Dollinger	McFall	Sheppard
Donohue	McGovern	Sisk
Doyle	Macdonald	Spence
Durham	Machrowicz	Springer
Dwyer	Mack, Ill.	Staggers
Eberhart	Madden	Steed
Edmondson	Magnuson	Sullivan
Elliott	Marshall	Talle
Engle	Matthews	Teague, Tex.
Evins	May	Teller
Farbstein	Metrow	Thompson, La.
Felghan	Metcalf	Thompson, N. J.
Fenton	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Tex.
Flood	Mills	Thornberry

Tollefson	Vinson	Wright
Trimble	Watts	Yates
Udall	Widnall	Young
Ullman	Wier	Zablocki
Vanik	Withrow	Zelenko
Van Zandt	Wolverton	

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson, Mont.	Brownson	Holtzman
Andresen, August H.	Cretella	Multer
Aspinall	Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.
Bowler	Dies	Sieminski
	Gregory	Utt
	Hillings	Walter

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Walter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Brownson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 23, strike out "\$10,888,000" and insert "\$10,600,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I feel compelled to ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 205, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—214

Abbott	Church	Hillings
Abernethy	Clevenger	Hoeven
Adair	Cole	Hoffman
Alexander	Collier	Holt
Alger	Colmer	Horan
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Ikard
Allen, Ill.	Coudert	Jackson
Andersen, H. Carl	Cramer	James
Andrews	Curtis, Mo.	Jenkins
Arends	Dague	Jennings
Ashmore	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Auchincloss	Dennison	Johansen
Avery	Derounian	Jonas
Ayres	Devereux	Jones, Mo.
Baker	Dooley	Kearney
Barden	Dorn, S. C.	Kearns
Bass, N. H.	Dowdy	Keating
Bates	Durham	Keeney
Beamer	Evins	Kilburn
Becker	Fallon	Kilday
Beckworth	Fisher	Kilgore
Belcher	Flynt	Kitchin
Bentley	Ford	Knox
Berry	Forrester	Krueger
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Laird
Bonner	Gary	Latham
Bosch	Gathings	LeCompte
Bow	Grant	Lennon
Boykin	Gross	Lipscomb
Brooks, La.	Gubser	Loser
Brooks, Tex.	Gwinn	McConnell
Brown, Ohio	Haley	McCulloch
Brownson	Halleck	McDonough
Broyhill	Harden	McGregor
Budge	Hardy	McIntire
Burleson	Harris	McMillan
Bush	Harrison, Nebr.	McVey
Byrne, Ill.	Harrison, Va.	Macdonald
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Mack, Wash.
Cannon	Hébert	Mahon
Cederberg	Hemphill	Mailliard
Chamberlain	Henderson	Martin
Chenoweth	Herlong	Mason
Chiperfield	Hess	Meader
Chelf	Hiestand	Merrrow
Chenoweth	Hill	Michel
Chiperfield		

Miller, Md.	Rutherford	Thomas
Miller, Nebr.	St. George	Thompson, La.
Miller, N. Y.	Schenck	Thompson, Tex.
Mills	Scherer	Thomson, Wyo.
Minshall	Schwengel	Thornberry
Morrison	Scott, N. C.	Tuck
Mumma	Scrivner	Utt
Murray	Scudder	Van Pelt
Neal	Selden	Vorys
Nicholson	Sheehan	Vursell
Nimtz	Shuford	Wainwright
Norblad	Sikes	Watts
O'Hara, Minn.	Siler	Weaver
Ostertag	Simpson, Ill.	Westland
Pillion	Simpson, Pa.	Wharton
Poage	Smith, Calif.	Whitener
Poff	Smith, Kans.	Whitten
Ray	Smith, Miss.	Wigglesworth
Reed	Smith, Va.	Williams, Miss.
Rees, Kans.	Smith, Wis.	Williams, N. Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Stauffer	Willis
Riehlman	Taber	Wilson, Calif.
Riley	Talle	Wilson, Ind.
Rivers	Taylor	Winstead
Robeson, Va.	Teague, Calif.	Younger
Robson, Ky.	Teague, Tex.	

NAYS—205

Addonizio	Fogarty	Moulder
Albert	Forand	Natcher
Anfuso	Fountain	Norrell
Ashley	Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.
Bailey	Friedel	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin	Fulton	O'Hara, Ill.
Baring	Garmatz	O'Konski
Barrett	Gavin	O'Neill
Bass, Tenn.	George	Osmer
Baumhart	Gordon	Passman
Bennett, Fla.	Granahan	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Gray	Patterson
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Pelly
Blitch	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Boggs	Griffin	Pfost
Boland	Griffiths	Philbin
Bolling	Hagen	Pilcher
Bolton	Hale	Polk
Boyle	Haskell	Porter
Bray	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Breeding	Hays, Ohio	Preston
Broomfield	Healey	Price
Brown, Ga.	Heseltan	Prouty
Brown, Mo.	Holfield	Rabaut
Buckley	Holland	Radwan
Burdick	Holmes	Rains
Byrd	Hosmer	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Huddleston	Rhodes, Pa.
Canfield	Hull	Roberts
Carnahan	Hyde	Rodino
Carrigg	Jarman	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Johnson	Rogers, Fla.
Christopher	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Mass.
Chudoff	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Clark	Karsten	Rooney
Coad	Kean	Roosevelt
Coffin	Kee	Sadlak
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Santangelo
Corbett	Kelly, N. Y.	Saund
Cunningham,	Keogh	Saylor
Iowa	King	Scott, Pa.
Cunningham,	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Nebr.	Kluczynski	Shelley
Curtin	Knutson	Sheppard
Curtis, Mass.	Landrum	Sisk
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Spence
Dawson, Utah	Lanham	Springer
Delaney	Lankford	Staggers
Dellay	Lesinski	Stauffer
Dempsey	Long	Steed
Denton	McCarthy	Sullivan
Diggs	McCormack	Teller
Dingell	McFall	Tewes
Dixon	McGovern	Thompson, N. J.
Dollinger	McIntosh	Tollefson
Donohue	Machrowicz	Trimble
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Ill.	Udall
Doyle	Madden	Ullman
Dwyer	Magnuson	Vanlk
Eberharther	Marshall	Van Zandt
Edmondson	Matthews	Vinson
Elliott	May	Watts
Engle	Metcalfe	Wharton
Farbstein	Miller, Calif.	Whitener
Fascell	Miller, Md.	Whitten
Feighan	Miller, N. Y.	Widnall
Fenton	Mills	Wier
Fino	Moore	Wigglesworth
Flood	Morano	Williams, N. Y.
	Morgan	Wilson, Calif.
	Morris	Withrow
	Morrison	Wolverton
	Moss	Wright
	Moulder	Yates
	Natcher	Young
	Nimtz	Zablocki
	O'Brien, Ill.	Zelenko
	O'Brien, N. Y.	
	O'Hara, Ill.	
	O'Konski	
	O'Neill	
	Osmer	
	Ostertag	
	Passman	
	Patman	
	Patterson	
	Pelly	
	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson,	Bowler	Holtzman
Mont.	Cretella	Multer
Andresen,	Davis, Tenn.	Reece, Tenn.
August H.	Dies	Sieminski
Aspinall	Gregory	Walter

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. BOYLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COUDERT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 7, strike out "\$9,300,000" and insert "\$7,973,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 285, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—130

Abbt	Dorn, S. C.	Minshall
Abernethy	Dowdy	Mumma
Adair	Evins	Murray
Alger	Fisher	Neal
Allen, Calif.	Flynt	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Norblad
Andersen,	George	Norrell
H. Carl	Grant	O'Hara, Minn.
Ashmore	Gross	Poff
Ayres	Gwinn	Ray
Baker	Haley	Reed
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.
Bates	Harvey	Robeson, Va.
Baumhart	Henderson	Rutherford
Becker	Herlong	St. George
Belcher	Hess	Schenck
Bentley	Hiestand	Scherer
Berry	Hill	Scrivner
Betts	Hillings	Siler
Bow	Hoffman	Simpson, Ill.
Brooks, La.	Hyde	Simpson, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Jackson	Smith, Calif.
Brownson	James	Smith, Kans.
Broyhill	Jenkins	Smith, Va.
Budge	Jensen	Smith, Wis.
Bush	Johansen	Taber
Byrne, Ill.	Jonas	Teague, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Cannon	Keeney	Thomas
Cederberg	Kilburn	Thomson, Wyo.
Chamberlain	Kilgore	Tuck
Chiperfield	Krueger	Utt
Cleaver	Lalrd	Van Pelt
Cole	Lipscomb	Vorys
Colmer	Loser	Vursell
Cooper	McCulloch	Wainwright
Cramer	McGregor	Weaver
Curtis, Mo.	McMillan	Westland
Dague	McVey	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Mack, Wash.	Willis
Dawson, Utah	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Derounian	Meader	Winstead
Devereux	Michel	Younger
Dooley	Miller, Nebr.	

NAYS—285

Addonizio	Barrett	Bosch
Albert	Bass, Tenn.	Boykin
Alexander	Beamer	Boyle
Andrews	Beckworth	Bray
Anfuso	Bennett, Fla.	Breeding
Arends	Bennett, Mich.	Brooks, Tex.
Ashley	Blatnik	Broomfield
Auchincloss	Blitch	Brown, Ga.
Avery	Boggs	Brown, Mo.
Bailey	Boland	Buckley
Baldwin	Bolling	Burdick
Barden	Bolton	Burleson
Baring	Bonner	Byrd

Byrne, Pa.	Holfield	Pfost
Canfield	Holland	Philbin
Carnahan	Holmes	Pilcher
Carrigg	Holt	Poage
Celler	Horan	Polk
Chelf	Hosmer	Porter
Chenoweth	Huddleston	Powell
Christopher	Hull	Preston
Chudoff	Ikard	Price
Church	Jarman	Prouty
Clark	Jennings	Rabaut
Coad	Johnson	Radwan
Coffin	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Collier	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Cooley	Judd	Rhodes, Ariz.
Corbett	Karsten	Rhodes, Pa.
Coudert	Kean	Riehlman
Cunningham,	Kearns	Riley
Iowa	Keating	Rivers
Cunningham,	Kee	Roberts
Nebr.	Kelley, Pa.	Robson, Ky.
Curtin	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Curtis, Mass.	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Delaney	King	Rogers, Mass.
Dellay	Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.
Dempsey	Kitchin	Rooney
Dennison	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Denton	Knox	Sadlak
Diggs	Knutson	Santangelo
Dingell	Landrum	Saund
Dixon	Lane	Saylor
Dollinger	Lanham	Schwengel
Donohue	Lankford	Scott, N. C.
Dorn, N. Y.	Latham	Scott, Pa.
Doyle	Lennon	Scudder
Durham	Lesinski	Seely-Brown
Dwyer	Long	Selden
Eberharther	McCarthy	Sheehan
Edmondson	McConnell	Shelley
Elliott	McCormack	Sheppard
Engle	McDonough	Shuford
Fallon	McFall	Sikes
Farbstein	McGovern	Sisk
Fascell	McIntire	Smith, Miss.
Feighan	McIntosh	Spence
Fenton	Macdonald	Springer
Fino	Machrowicz	Staggers
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Stauffer
Fogarty	Madden	Steed
Forand	Magnuson	Sullivan
Ford	Mahon	Talle
Forrester	Mailliard	Taylor
Fountain	Marshall	Teller
Frazier	Martin	Tewes
Frelinghuysen	Matthews	Thompson, La.
Friedel	May	Thompson, N. J.
Fulton	Metcalfe	Thompson, Tex.
Garmatz	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Gary	Miller, Md.	Tollefson
Gavin	Miller, N. Y.	Trimble
Gordon	Mills	Udall
Granahan	Moore	Ullman
Gray	Morano	Vanlk
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Van Zandt
Green, Pa.	Morris	Vinson
Griffin	Morrison	Watts
Griffiths	Moss	Wharton
Hagen	Moulder	Whitener
Hale	Natcher	Whitten
Halleck	Nimtz	Widnall
Harden	O'Brien, Ill.	Wier
Hardy	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Harris	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
Harrison, Va.	O'Konski	Wilson, Calif.
Haskell	O'Neill	Withrow
Hays, Ark.	Osmer	Wolverton
Hays, Ohio	Ostertag	Wright
Healey	Passman	Yates
Hébert	Patman	Young
Hemphill	Patterson	Zablocki
Heseltan	Pelly	Zelenko
Hoeven	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson,	Davis, Tenn.	Multer
Mont.	Dies	Pillion
Andresen,	Gregory	Reece, Tenn.
August H.	Gubser	Sieminski
Aspinall	Holtzman	Walter
Bowler	LeCompte	
Cretella	Morrow	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Multer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Cretella.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Gubser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 15, strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$5,518,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 207, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—206

Abbitt	Forrester	Mumma
Abernethy	Fountain	Murray
Adair	Frazier	Neal
Alexander	Gary	Nicholson
Alger	Gathings	Norblad
Allen, Calif.	George	O'Hara, Minn.
Allen, Ill.	Grant	Ostertag
Andersen,	Gross	Poage
H. Carl	Gubser	Poff
Andrews	Gwinn	Prouty
Arends	Haley	Ray
Ashmore	Harden	Reed
Auchincloss	Hardy	Rees, Kans.
Avery	Harrison, Nebr.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Ayres	Harrison, Va.	Riehlman
Baker	Harvey	Riley
Barden	Hébert	Robeson, Va.
Bass, N. H.	Hemphill	Robson, Ky.
Bass, Tenn.	Henderson	Rogers, Fla.
Bates	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Baumhart	Hess	Rutherford
Beamer	Hiestand	St. George
Becker	Hill	Schenck
Belcher	Hillings	Scherer
Bentley	Hoeven	Scott, N. C.
Berry	Hoffman	Scrivner
Betts	Holt	Scudder
Blich	Hosmer	Selden
Bonner	Huddleston	Sheehan
Bosch	Ikard	Shuford
Bow	Jackson	Sikes
Boyle	James	Siler
Brooks, La.	Jarman	Simpson, Ill.
Brooks, Tex.	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Jennings	Smith, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Brownson	Johansen	Smith, Va.
Broyhill	Jonas	Smith, Wis.
Budge	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Burleson	Kearney	Stauffer
Bush	Keating	Steed
Byrne, Ill.	Keeney	Taber
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Taylor
Cannon	Kilgore	Teague, Calif.
Cederberg	Kitchin	Thomas
Chamberlain	Krueger	Thompson, La.
Chenoweth	Laird	Thompson, Tex.
Chiperfield	Landrum	Thomson, Wyo.
Church	Latham	Tuck
Clevenger	Lennon	Utt
Cole	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Collier	Loser	Vorys
Colmer	McCulloch	Vursell
Cooper	McDonough	Wainwright
Cramer	McGregor	Weaver
Cunningham,	McIntire	Westland
Nebr.	McMillan	Wharton
Curtis, Mass.	Macdonald	Whitener
Curtis, Mo.	Mack, Wash.	Whitten
Dague	Mahon	Widnall
Davis, Ga.	Mailliard	Williams, Miss.
Dennison	Mason	Williams, N. Y.
Derounian	Matthews	Willis
Devereux	Meador	Wilson, Calif.
Dooley	Michel	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Md.	Winstead
Dowdy	Miller, Nebr.	Young
Durham	Miller, N. Y.	Younger
Fisher	Mills	
Flynt	Minshall	

NAYS—207

Addonizio	Garmatz	Norrell
Albert	Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.
Anfuso	Gordon	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ashley	Granahan	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Gray	O'Konski
Baldwin	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill
Baring	Green, Pa.	Osmer
Barrett	Griffin	Passman
Beckworth	Griffiths	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	Patterson
Bennett, Mich.	Hale	Pelly
Blatnik	Halleck	Perkins
Boggs	Harris	Pfost
Boland	Haskell	Philbin
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	Pilcher
Boiton	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Bray	Healey	Porter
Breeding	Heseltin	Powell
Broomfield	Hollifield	Preston
Brown, Mo.	Holland	Price
Buckley	Holmes	Rabaut
Burdick	Horan	Radwan
Byrd	Hull	Rains
Byrnes, Pa.	Hyde	Reuss
Canfield	Johnson	Rhodes, Pa.
Carrigg	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Chelf	Judd	Roberts
Christopher	Karsten	Rodino
Chudoff	Kean	Rogers, Colo.
Clark	Kearns	Rogers, Mass.
Coad	Kee	Rooney
Coffin	Kelley, Pa.	Roosevelt
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadiak
Corbett	Keogh	Santangelo
Coudert	Kilday	Saund
Cunningham,	King	Saylor
Iowa	Kirwan	Schwengel
Curtin	Kluczynski	Scott, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	Knox	Seely-Brown
Dawson, Utah	Knutson	Shelley
Deaney	Lane	Sheppard
Dellay	Lanham	Sisk
Dempsey	Lankford	Smith, Miss.
Denton	Lesinski	Spence
Diggs	Long	Staggers
Dingell	McCarthy	Sullivan
Dixon	McConnell	Talle
Dollinger	McCormack	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	McFall	Teller
Dorn, N. Y.	McGovern	Tewes
Doyle	McIntosh	Thompson, N. J.
Dwyer	McVey	Thornberry
Eberhart	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Edmondson	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Elliott	Madden	Udall
Engle	Magnuson	Ullman
Evins	Marshall	Vanik
Fallon	Martin	Van Zandt
Farbstein	May	Vinson
Fascelli	Metcalf	Watts
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Fenton	Moore	Wigglesworth
Fino	Morano	Withrow
Flood	Morgan	Wolverton
Fogarty	Morris	Wright
Forand	Morrison	Yates
Ford	Moss	Zablocki
Frelinghuysen	Moulder	Zelenko
Friedel	Natcher	
Fulton	Nimtz	

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson,	Carnahan	LeCompte
Mont.	Celler	Merrow
Andresen,	Cretella	Multer
August H.	Davis, Tenn.	Pillion
Aspinall	Dies	Reece, Tenn.
Bowler	Gregory	Sieminski
Boykin	Holtzman	Walter

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Cretella.

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Pillion.

Mrs. BOLTON changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, lines 23, strike out the paragraph down to and including line 6 on page 20.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, strike out lines 1 through 4.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, may I announce that this is the last amendment on which we are going to ask for a rollcall vote at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order. Before the Chair knew what he was doing, he made a statement.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 231, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—185

Abbitt	Curtis, Mass.	Johansen
Abernethy	Curtis, Mo.	Jonas
Adair	Dague	Judd
Alexander	Davis, Ga.	Kean
Alger	Dawson, Utah	Kearney
Allen, Calif.	Derounian	Keating
Allen, Ill.	Dixon	Keeney
Andersen,	Dooley	Kilburn
H. C.	Dorn, N. Y.	Kilgore
Arend	Dorn, S. C.	Krueger
Ashmore	Dowdy	Laird
Auchincloss	Dwyer	Latham
Avery	Finó	Lipscomb
Ayres	Fisher	McCormack
Barden	Flynt	McCulloch
Bass, N. H.	Ford	McDonough
Bates	Frelinghuysen	McGregor
Beamer	Gary	McIntire
Becker	George	McVey
Belcher	Gross	Macdonald
Bentley	Gubser	Mahon
Berry	Gwinn	Mailliard
Betts	Hale	Martin
Bolton	Haley	Mason
Bosch	Halleck	Meador
Bow	Harden	Michel
Bray	Hardy	Miller, Nebr.
Broomfield	Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Harrison, Va.	Minshall
Brownson	Harvey	Morano
Budge	Haskell	Mumma
Burleson	Hébert	Murray
Byrne, Ill.	Hemphill	Neal
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Nicholson
Canfield	Herlong	Nimtz
Cannon	Heseltin	Norblad
Cederberg	Hess	O'Brien, N. Y.
Chamberlain	Hiestand	O'Hara, Minn.
Chiperfield	Hill	Osmer
Church	Hillings	Ostertag
Clevenger	Hoeven	Pelly
Cole	Hoffman	Pillion
Collier	Holt	Poff
Colmer	Hosmer	Prouty
Coudert	Ikard	Radwan
Cunningham,	Jackson	Ray
Iowa	James	Reed
Cunningham,	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Nebr.	Jensen	Riehlman

Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Scrivner
Scudder
Sheehan
Shuford
Siler
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.

Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stauffer
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tewes
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Vorys

Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Younger

NAYS—231

Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Boyle
Breeding
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Broyhill
Buckley
Burdick
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Carrigg
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Coad
Coffin
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Dellay
Dempsey
Dennison
Denton
Devereux
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson,
Mont.
Andresen,
August H.
Aspinall
Bowler

Carnahan
Cretella
Davis, Tenn.
Dies
Holtzman
LeCompte

Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Porter
Powell
Preston
Price
Rabaut
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robson, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scott, Pa.
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Watts
Whitten
Wier
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

On this vote:

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Multer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cretella.
Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 20, after the word "Interior", insert "at the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 2, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$1,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 17, strike out "\$9,450,000" and insert "\$9,384,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 6287) to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment as follows: On page 18, line 3, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by many Members of the House to briefly summarize each of the 18 amendments which were adopted in the Committee of the Whole House to H. R. 6287, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Before summarizing each of these amendments, I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that the effect of the House action in the Committee of the Whole House in carefully analyzing the appropriations line by line contained in this appropriation bill, has been tremendous. Since this bill has been on the floor for action three other appropriation bills have been marked up by subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee. These markups have brought about substantial reductions, particularly in new personnel items for the Departments of Commerce, State, and Justice. Requests for additional new personnel have been severely trimmed for these three departments because of the manifestation on the part of the House in the last 7 days that it is truly interested in holding down the number of new employees provided for in the President's budget.

At the present time there are over 2,390,000 Federal civilian employees on the Government payroll. The \$71.8 billion executive budget submitted by President Eisenhower to this Congress makes provisions for an addition to the civilian payroll of our Federal Government of 30,000 employees. The House of Representatives in adopting the amendments in the Committee of the Whole House has shown that it is most interested in holding down all requests for new funds to hire additional Federal employees to the minimum. It might be pointed out that in all the amendments which will be voted upon today, not a single reduction over the Committee recommendations as far as health and welfare personnel, was made. However the employment levels in those areas which do not directly affect the health and welfare of our citizens were maintained by the action of the Committee of the Whole House at very close to the 1957 employment levels. None of the amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole House would have eliminated a single position in the Department of Labor or in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare but are an attempt to hold the line below the 1957 employment level. As a matter of fact not a single amendment was adopted which provides less money for personal services than the particular bureau in two departments received in last year's budget. These amendments, therefore, do not cut the present Federal budget but merely make reductions in the requests for additions in the fiscal year 1958 executive budget. Every amendment adopted will in fact give the particular bureau involved more money for personal services than it received in the current fiscal year.

Oftentimes, we as Members of Congress seem to accept the requests of the executive department for the new fiscal year as the basis of making statements that cuts in Federal spending have been made when, in fact, no reductions are actually made in the spending levels of the various bureaus involved. Reductions are merely made in the President's requests of Congress to appropriate certain funds. The Congress has the sole responsibility under our Constitution, particularly the House of Representa-

So the amendment was rejected:

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

tives, for controlling the purse strings of this Nation. Any request by the President can be granted in full or refused in full. It can be granted in part or refused in part. It is like the experience all of us have in our own families. One of our children wants a \$1 allowance. At the present time he is receiving a 75-cent allowance. The \$1 figure is a request he makes of us. Just because our son asked for it, we do not give it to him and no matter how high a regard we may have for the President of the United States, be he Democrat or Republican, we should not blindly give him everything he asks for in his budget requests. If we deny our son the \$1 allowance which he requests and give him 85 cents as an allowance, we are, in fact, making no cut in his budget but are granting him an increase of 10 cents. The amendments which we are voting on today follow this same pattern. We are making no cut in the present salary and expense allowance of any bureau or division in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. We are giving them an increase in their present allowance but not giving them the total increase which they requested through the offices of the President. The job of controlling appropriations is vested in the United States Congress and it rightfully belongs there.

There are Members of Congress who are willing to pass the buck to the executive branch of Government in the matter of controlling Federal employment and Federal budget, in an effort to escape their responsibility for Federal spending. It should always be remembered that the executive branch merely requests certain sums of money from the legislative branch and under our Constitution, the responsibility for authorizing expenditures, is clearly vested in the Congress. Regardless of whether there is a Republican or a Democrat in the White House, it is incumbent upon the Congress never to abdicate its responsibility for control of Federal employment and Federal spending.

Only yesterday President Eisenhower in a press conference indicated to the press and through them to the citizens of our Nation that Federal civilian employment should be reduced and not expanded. The House in the past 7 days has clearly indicated its intentions of not drastically raising Federal employment above the current level. This action symbolized to the executive departments the intention of this Congress to keep some check on the continuing increases of personnel in every department and agency of our Federal Government. This same policy has been and will be followed by me on every appropriation bill reaching the floor of the House in this session of Congress regardless of the fact that I may be in the minority in my point of view.

I have summarized each of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House and acted upon by the House this afternoon.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and reduces the item of salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary of

Labor on page 2, lines 11 and 12, from \$1,510,000 to \$1,480,000, or a reduction of \$30,000. The effect of this amendment is to deny three new positions which were to be established in the Department of Labor here in Washington to handle international labor affairs in two areas of the world—South America and the Near East. This activity can and will be carried on by the number of employees allowed in this budget request for 1958. The current employment level on February 28, 1957, in the Office of the Secretary was 168 positions. This 1958 bill, after the adoption of this amendment, will allow for 183 positions, as compared with 173 authorized in 1957, or an increase of 10 positions. The appropriation for the Office of the Secretary, placing the appropriation for 1957 on a comparable basis with the activities to be carried out by the Office in fiscal year 1958, shows that the appropriation to the Secretary's Office is increased from \$1,422,800 to \$1,480,000. These figures take into consideration the plans which the Department of Labor have to transfer from this appropriation to other appropriation items in this bill, certain activities which were carried on in the Office of the Secretary in fiscal year 1957. Taking all these adjustments into consideration, the amount allowed after the adoption of the Budget amendment is sufficient to support all activities of this Office at a higher level than in the current fiscal year.

We have heard a lot of talk about the increases in Department of Labor being necessary to carry out the laws that we passed last year. Now that just is not factual. We did not pass any legislation last year that added appreciably to the workload of the Department of Labor with one single exception—the Federal Aid Highway Act. That act did require some additional work in the Office of the Solicitor and a special appropriation from the highway trust fund is included in the bill for that. But I think it is important to keep in mind that, with this exception there is not a single piece of new legislation that would require any appreciable increase in this Department's activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 2. OFFICE OF SOLICITOR, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and amended by an amendment by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and reduces the item of salaries and expenses on page 3, line 9, in the Office of the Solicitor from \$2,225,000 to \$2,021,000, or a reduction of \$204,000 in the budget request. In fiscal year 1957 there was a total of \$2,321,000 made available to the Office of the Solicitor for salaries and expenses including the transfer of \$300,000 from the highway trust fund. If this amendment is adopted, the Office of the Solicitor will have available for salaries and expenses \$2,386,000 which includes \$365,000 transferred from the highway trust fund for salaries and expenses in fiscal year 1958. The current employment level in the Office of the Solicitor on February 28, 1957, was 327 positions. Although the number of positions allowed in the 1957 budget for

362 positions. This amendment provides that no new positions can be added in the Office of the Solicitor, above the number allowed in the 1957 budget but will allow for a higher employment level that was in effect on February 28, 1957. At the beginning of this year, just a little over 8 months ago, this Office had 285 employees and last year they averaged 261 employees, so an amendment to hold them to just a little more than their current employment of 327 certainly is not going to hurt anything.

AMENDMENT NO. 3. BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and reduces the item for salary and expenses on page 4, line 7, for the Bureau of Labor Standards from \$1,031,300 to \$985,000, or a reduction of \$46,300. This amendment continues the personnel level in this agency at the current 1957 employment figure. It adds to the funds appropriated a sufficient amount to take care of retirement pay to the Civil Service Commission and it also takes care of the extra day's pay which is being encountered in all of these departments in fiscal year 1958. The appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Standards for fiscal year 1957 was \$911,500. Upon the adoption of this amendment the amount available for the Bureau of Labor Standards in 1958 will be \$985,000. The current employment level in the Bureau of Labor Standards on February 28, 1957 was 107 positions and the number of positions allowed in the 1957 budget were 113. The same employment figure for 1958 is allowed upon the adoption of this amendment. For the last 3 years in succession increases in personnel have been provided for this Bureau. They have no new programs that they are required to administer, they just keep expanding, it certainly is in order that this Bureau at least level off.

AMENDMENT NO. 4. BUREAU OF VETERANS REEMPLOYMENT

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] on the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights, page 4, line 18, and provides for \$406,000 for fiscal year 1958, a decrease of \$136,000 from the amount originally allowed in the bill, but an increase over the 1957 appropriation of \$23,000. This amendment provides for the same number of positions authorized in fiscal year 1957 and adds to the amount of money available in 1957 an appropriation equal to the increased payments to the civil-service retirement fund and money for the extra day's pay.

AMENDMENT NO. 5. BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] on page 5, line 8, for the Bureau of Employment Security, and provides \$5,558,000 for salaries and expenses, a decrease of \$442,000 from the amount originally included in the bill, or maintains the same appropriation level to this Bureau that was established in the 1957 budget. The current employment level as of February 28, 1957, in the Bureau of Employment Security was 731 positions. The number of positions

allowed in the 1957 budget is 768. This Bureau also has expanded substantially in the last couple of years. At the end of fiscal year 1955 they had 706 employees. Now they have 731. Certainly just stopping the further expansion is not going to have any disastrous effects.

AMENDMENT NO. 6. GRANTS TO STATES

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and amended by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] on the item on page 6, line 5, "Grants to States." This amendment has the net result of reducing the appropriation to grants to States by \$186,000, the total of two increases made by the Bureau of the Budget over the amounts originally requested by the Department of Labor as set forth in the table on page 29 of the committee hearings. This reduction was conceded by the chairman of the subcommittee because of the confusion resulting from the table provided for the record by the Department of Labor. Although this amendment shows up as a \$12,186,000 reduction, this is the result of a point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] against the language beginning after the first figure on line 5 of page 6 of the bill, which the Chair held was legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law. The language which was stricken from the bill by this point of order provided for the expenditure of \$12 million to meet increased cost of administration resulting from changes in a State law, increases in the number of claims filed for unemployment compensation in the States during the next fiscal year, or increases in State salaries. In view of the fact that this contingency language was stricken from the bill, it will be necessary to secure authorizing legislation through the Committee on Labor and Education in order to make this \$12 million available, or similar language can be reinserted in conference between the House and Senate. Therefore, the net result of this amendment, because of the elimination of the contingency fund language on the point of order is merely the reduction of \$186,000 which was conceded by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. FOGARTY].

AMENDMENT NO. 7. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] and reduces the item on page 8, line 24. The amendment provides for \$25 million to cover the cost of unemployment compensation to Federal employees during fiscal year 1958. This is a reduction of \$1,500,000 from the original amount included in the bill, and is the same amount carried in the 1957 appropriation for this item. This figure of course is an estimate of the amount that will be needed to make unemployment compensation payments to Federal employees during fiscal year 1958. It is most difficult to estimate the amount necessary for this particular item and under the existing authorization passed by the Congress, if this estimate is too low, additional funds will necessarily be made available in a deficiency appropriation. However, there is no foreseen

able reason why the level of payments to Federal workers in 1958 will be at a higher level than 1957.

AMENDMENT NO. 8. MEXICAN FARM LABOR

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] for the Mexican farm labor program on page 9, line 15. This amendment provides that salaries and expenses for the Mexican farm-labor program will be established at \$2,236,200 for fiscal year 1958. Upon the adoption of this amendment the Mexican farm-labor program for fiscal year 1958 will provide for the same level of employment as in fiscal year 1957. The current employment level for the Mexican farm-labor program as of February 28, 1957, was 281 positions. The positions allowed in the 1957 budget were 332. The President in his budget requested an increase in the positions allowed for 1958 to 389. It was the feeling of the majority of the members in the Committee of the Whole House that new authorizing legislation should be immediately enacted which would provide that the entire cost of this particular activity of recruiting, supervising, and placing the Mexican farm-labor employees should be borne by the employers through a revolving-fund authorization. This amendment disallows the increase in positions until such a time as this authorizing legislation is enacted by the Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 9. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], page 11, line 7. Bureau of Labor Statistics. This amendment provides for an addition of \$327,000 to cover the mandatory contributions to the Retirement Fund by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and eliminates the proposed expansion of present studies and programs with new and additional employees in fiscal year 1958. The current employment level of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as of February 28, 1957 was 986 employees. The number of positions allowed in the 1957 budget was 1,001. The number of positions provided in the bill for fiscal year 1958 was 1,024. This amendment would not allow 23 additional new positions in this Bureau in fiscal year 1958. The amount of money made available to the Bureau of Labor Statistics would be \$7,124,000 for fiscal year 1958 as compared with \$6,887,000 for the current fiscal year.

AMENDMENT NO. 10. WOMEN'S BUREAU

This amendment was introduced by the gentlewoman of Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] and amended by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], page 11, line 12, and provides for an appropriation of \$431,000 for salaries and expenses in the Women's Bureau for fiscal year 1958. This amendment would hold the employment level in the Women's Bureau at the same level as this year. The appropriation in fiscal year 1957 to the Women's Bureau was \$403,000 and this bill, with the adoption of this amendment, will provide for \$431,000 for fiscal year 1958. The effect of this amendment is to deny four new positions in the Women's Bureau for fiscal year 1958. The original amendment as

offered by Mrs. BLITCH of Georgia would not have made provision for an increase of \$28,000 which is necessary to cover the contributions to the Civil Service Retirement Fund and would have maintained the appropriation at the \$403,000 appropriation level of 1957. The amendment to the amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] provided for this necessary increase over the 1957 appropriation level.

AMENDMENT NO. 11. WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], page 11, lines 23 and 24, and provides for an appropriation of \$10,600,000 for salaries and expenses in 1958 for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. This amendment would provide for an appropriation equal to what the Division will spend this year, plus an additional \$600,000, which will be sufficient to cover all mandatory cost increases such as contributions to the civil service retirement fund. The current employment level in the Wage and Hour Division as of February 28, 1957, was 1,452. The positions allowed in the 1957 budget provided for 1,535 positions. The employment level in this Division was substantially increased in the 1957 budget. During fiscal year 1956 employment averaged only 1,170 and during 1955 it averaged less than 1,000, to be exact, 989. This amendment certainly cannot be seriously called a crippling cut.

AMENDMENT NO. 12. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], page 13, line 7, and provides for \$7,973,000 for salaries and expenses in the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 1958. This amendment increases the 1957 appropriation by \$1,194,000. Four hundred and nineteen thousand dollars of this will be used to cover mandatory cost increases of contributions to the civil service retirement fund and the extra day's pay in fiscal year 1958, leaving an increase in appropriations for the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 1958, as compared with fiscal year 1957 of \$775,000 to be used for new personnel or other expenses in the Food and Drug Administration. The employment level in the Food and Drug Administration as of February 28, 1957, was 1,130 positions. The number of permanent positions allowed in the 1957 budget was 1,184. This amendment will allow for an increase in the number of positions in 1958. In this agency also the 1957 employment is substantially above last year. In fiscal year 1956 this average employment was 1,031, and in 1955 it was an even 800.

AMENDMENT NO. 13. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], page 15, line 15, and provides for \$5,518,000 for salaries and expenses in the Office of Education, a decrease of \$1,482,000 from the amount originally provided in the bill, but an increase over the 1957 appropriation of \$248,000 which will take care of the necessary mandatory increases for 1958. The current employment level as of February 28,

1957, in the Office of Education, covered by this salary and expense item was 493. The number of positions allowed in the 1957 budget was 564. The original budget estimate included an increase in positions to 639. As pointed out in the committee's report on page 12, "Last year an increase of 133 positions was allowed for 1957. Less than half of the additional positions provided for 1957 had been filled by the end of the seventh month of the fiscal year." So this amendment will still allow sufficient funds for a very substantial increase in 1958 over the current employment. It is also interesting to note that while they now have 493 employees and more could be added under this amendment, back only to 1956 they had an average employment of 417.

AMENDMENT NO. 14. PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD], page 19, line 23 through page 20, line 6, and deletes the total appropriation made available for the President's Committee on Education beyond the high school in the amount of \$200,000. Under the language of the appropriation bill which was stricken by this amendment, this \$200,000 was made available for expenditure by this Committee up to December 31, 1957, when the Committee would have to disband under the original language of the bill. This amendment will provide that no funds will be available after June 30, 1957. The Appropriations Committee itself refused to allow any funds for this activity when it was first presented last year, and the members on the majority side of the Committee have repeatedly indicated that they have serious reservations about this item, in fact, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] who is in charge of the bill has indicated that he would not even ask for a separate vote on this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 15. LOCAL SEWER AND DISPOSAL GRANTS

This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], pages 25, lines 1 through 4, and provides that no appropriation will be available for fiscal year 1958 for grants to local municipalities to build sewer and waste-treatment projects. This amendment deletes the total appropriation of \$50 million which was authorized last year. During the past few weeks my office has had more complaints about this program than any other Federal program operating in our district. Those communities which were denied funds are complaining about the communities to which grants were made. Those communities which have already gone ahead and built their waste treatment and sewage facilities are complaining that this program is not retroactive and for that reason does not help them. The argument of the communities that have already gone ahead and built their waste treatment plants is that they lived up to their duty as far as treating their sewage and because they moved forward they are penalized and cannot receive any Federal aid. In the last 2 weeks this has clearly proved to me that the

Federal Government has no business getting into this program on this \$50 million basis. Holding out this amount of Federal bait which would be made available in this appropriation would merely hold up and delay the construction of sewage-disposal plants in many communities that will wait for Federal funds which will not be forthcoming under such a limited program for years and years. It would have been for better for us to delete these funds in 1958 and the local communities would then move forward on the necessary programs immediately.

AMENDMENT NO. 16. INDIAN HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

This amendment on page 27, line 20, was introduced by me. It is just a technical amendment to remove an objection some Members have to the language previously carried in the bill, which leaves to the Bureau of the Budget the determination of whether the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of the Interior administers the program for construction of Indian hospitals. My amendment clearly places the responsibility for making this decision with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who, under basic legislation is charged with the overall program for Indian health.

AMENDMENT NO. 17. BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

This amendment, on page 33, line 2, was introduced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and reduces salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Public Assistance from \$2 million to \$1,900,000, a reduction of \$100,000. This provides in full for the personnel this Bureau has now, in fact, it allows for all mandatory cost increases and over \$20,000 in addition. The amendment merely reduces the increase allowed by our committee for personnel to administer the proposed new training program for public welfare employees in the States. This program was rejected by the House.

The committee report clearly earmarked \$100,000 for administration of a program that has since been rejected, therefore there is no contest over this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 18. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

This amendment, on page 39, line 17, was offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]. It reduces funds for the salaries and expenses of the National Labor Relations Board from \$9,450,000 to \$9,384,800, a reduction of \$65,200. The amendment would provide the same amount as was appropriated for 1957 plus sufficient funds to cover the mandatory contributions to the civil-service retirement fund. This amendment was accepted by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] who has charge of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the debate on H. R. 6287, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], undertook to describe the "damage" that had been done in reducing the committee recommendations for the Bureau of Employment

Security. If it is "damage" for the Congress of the United States to endeavor to institute meritorious economies during the consideration of appropriation bills, then perhaps we all stand guilty as charged. Probably we will be equally as guilty when we vote for long overdue tax reduction for the American people made possible by the reductions we have made in scheduled expenditures. Similarly we will be responsible for "damage" when we make it possible to devote some of the budgetary surplus that will result from these cut expenditures to debt reduction. In short, the subcommittee chairman accuses us of "damage" when what the Congress in fact is doing is making a bipartisan effort to achieve fiscal responsibility.

While we may be depriving the bureaucrats of the taxpayers' dollars, we need not necessarily be depriving the American citizens of any essential Government service.

The Members of the House may recall that during the debate on H. R. 6287 on April 3 I included as part of my remarks a factual explanation as to the true effect of an amendment that was adopted by the Committee on the Whole with respect to the Bureau of Employment Security. My remarks on that subject appear on page 4490 of the RECORD and were addressed to a cut of slightly in excess of \$12 million. In essence, I explained that the amount remaining in the appropriation was sufficient so that the Labor Department would not be required to impair any of the services that are presently available with respect to the payment of unemployment compensation benefits.

Subsequent to my remarks on that subject the gentleman from Rhode Island then addressed himself to an amendment that reduced the Bureau of Employment Security funds by \$442,000. So that the record may be clear with respect to this economy effort, let me point out that the Bureau of Employment Security is in no way responsible for supervising unemployment insurance tax collections. Let me point out that unemployment insurance benefit payments are made by the States. Let me point out that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and not the Labor Department, is the executive department primarily responsible for vocational rehabilitation of both our aged and our physically handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the Congress with respect to this appropriation for the Bureau of Employment Security is irrefutably a meritorious economy measure that will mean less waste of the taxpayers' dollars without impairment of any essential Government service providing for the welfare of our American citizens, whether such citizens be employed or unemployed, handicapped or in good health, aged or young.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, although I have consistently voted in 17 instances today for the reduction of budgetary items presented the House, I did not support the proposal to eliminate completely the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to expend, as approved by the 84th Con-

gress, the sum of \$50 million in grants to the States for use in water pollution prevention programs. I did not support this 100 percent cut in appropriation on the basis that Public Law 660 set up this comprehensive program of assistance and that many States and communities have already expended considerable sums and in many instances have issued bonds after devotion of a great deal of time and research on urgently needed facilities. They have placed reliance in this congressional action of 1956 and we should meet our implied commitments. I am frank to say, understanding the need for economy today, that I would have supported a reasonable reduction in the amount proposed by the Department, I do not believe the program, once approved, should be wholly eliminated by action taken on an appropriation bill solely on an arbitrary basis as proposed in the amendment presented to the House. The effect would have been that of a complete repeal of the substantive law itself by 100 percent elimination of the item.

This is a most important matter to the State of Florida. To date the Florida State Board of Health has received 39 applications with a total of \$57.4 million total cost of which \$21.5 million would be eligible under Public Law 660. Of that portion being eligible, if sufficient funds were appropriated by Congress, it would require \$5.2 million to allocate the 30 percent which points up the fact that Public Law 660 was a good bill and does provide the necessary incentive which

was the primary purpose of the program when it was enacted in the Congress last year, our country being billions behind in needed sewage plant construction and water pollution control.

To demonstrate to the House the advanced stages of this planning and programming in my State I would present at this time a list of applications and their rating as prepared for priority recommendation by the Florida State Board of Health.

The United States Public Health Service has allocated \$910,000 to the State of Florida for the fiscal year 1956-57. The first cutoff date for applications for grants from funds allocated for 1956-57 was set at January 15, 1957. At that time, 38 applications had been received and the ratings have been determined. Table II lists the applicants in order of their receipt showing the amount of grant requested, the identifying project number and points awarded under the above described system. Actual priority has been assigned only to the top 15 projects. These are shown in order of priority in table I. Note, however, that final decision on the propriety of grants and on the amount of grant to be awarded rests with the United States Public Health Service. It is quite possible that an applicant with a high priority will be ruled ineligible for all or some part of the funds requested and these funds will then be available for other applicants.

Public Law No. 660 authorizes grants each year for 10 years. Provided Con-

gress appropriates necessary funds for fiscal year 1957-58, a new cutoff date will be set shortly after July 1, 1957. All previous applicants who have not received grants will be given an opportunity to renew their application and a new priority table will be prepared including not only those that have already applied but also any new applications received prior to the cutoff date. It is obvious, however, that at the present rate of growth there probably will never be sufficient funds to give grants to all deserving applicants and there is every indication that construction costs will continue to rise. Accordingly, every possible effort should be made to proceed with needed sewerage improvement projects without delay regardless of the possible nonavailability of grant funds.

TABLE NO. I.—Approved under priority recommendations (in order of priority) 1956-57

Applicant	Priority points	Grant requested	Cumulative subtotal
Wauchula.....	30	\$155,100.00	-----
Wildwood.....	28	27,000.00	\$182,100
Apalachicola.....	26	75,764.00	257,864
Naples.....	24	86,416.20	344,280
Bellevue.....	24	40,387.27	384,667
Callahan.....	24	40,425.00	425,092
Cocoa Beach.....	23	97,500.00	522,592
Belle Glade.....	23	227,351.78	749,943
Lynn Haven.....	22	127,180.18	867,123
Okeechobee.....	22	105,785.04	972,908
Inverness.....	22	63,467.00	1,036,375
Long Key.....	22	250,000.00	1,286,375
Arcadia.....	21	73,437.00	1,559,812
New Smyrna Beach.....	21	154,732.28	1,514,544
DeFuniak Springs.....	21	108,090.00	1,622,544

TABLE NO. II.—Total list of applications for Public Law 660 grants to date

Applicant	Total cost of project	Design population	Per capita cost	Median family income	Public health necessity paragraph	Rating points			
						Public health necessity	Median income	Per capita cost	Total
Naples.....	\$288,054.00	5,350	\$54.00	\$1,637	4	14	5	5	24
Okeechobee.....	342,616.80	3,000	114.00	1,269	5	12	5	5	22
Cocoa Beach.....	325,000.00	2,000	163.00	1,724	4	14	4	5	23
Inverness.....	211,557.00	3,000	70.00	1,380	5	12	5	5	22
Lake Worth.....	1,859,079.51	34,000	54.50	1,690	6	10	4	5	19
Wauchula.....	517,000.00	10,000	51.70	1,639	1	20	5	5	30
Long Key Sewer District.....	937,314.23	18,000	52.00	1,990	4	14	3	5	22
Bellevue.....	134,625.96	2,000	67.50	1,443	4	14	5	5	24
Pensacola.....	566,400.00	45,200	12.50	2,023	4	14	3	1	18
Belle Glade.....	757,838.00	18,000	42.00	1,387	4	14	5	4	23
Fort Pierce.....	570,500.00	48,000	11.85	2,035	6	10	3	1	14
Santa Rosa Island.....	103,397.00	4,000	26.00	2,154	9	7	2	2	11
North Beach area, Dade County.....	865,000.00	17,000	51.00	2,500	4	14	1	5	20
Jacksonville.....	2,281,000.00	80,000	28.50	2,164	4	14	2	2	18
Atlantic Beach.....	302,414.76	5,000	60.50	2,306	4	14	1	5	20
Lakeland.....	723,600.00	60,000	12.00	2,002	5	12	3	1	16
Gulfport.....	486,000.00	12,000	40.50	2,138	4	14	2	4	20
St. Augustine.....	2,200,000.00	30,000	73.50	1,918	5	12	3	5	20
Sewer District No. 1, Duval County.....	192,400.00	7,704	25.00	2,306	4	14	1	2	17
Callahan.....	134,750.00	1,750	77.25	1,632	4	14	5	5	24
Havana.....	185,288.00	3,000	62.00	1,238	7	8	5	5	18
Vero Beach.....	897,000.00	20,400	44.00	2,409	4	14	1	4	19
New Smyrna Beach.....	515,744.28	13,000	39.50	2,077	3	16	2	3	21
Clearwater.....	754,897.69	35,500	21.30	2,345	6	10	1	2	13
Riviera Beach.....	730,000.00	12,000	61.00	1,957	6	10	3	5	18
Apalachicola.....	252,548.00	4,000	63.00	1,271	3	16	5	5	25
De Funiak Springs.....	360,000.00	5,000	72.00	1,784	5	12	4	5	21
Fort Lauderdale.....	1,283,200.00	30,000	42.50	2,513	4	14	1	3	18
Arcadia.....	244,791.00	6,000	40.75	1,578	5	12	5	4	21
Eau Gallie.....	351,665.00	6,000	58.50	1,724	6	10	4	5	19
Opa Locka.....	3,980,000.00	-----	-----	2,730	4	14	1	-----	-----
Lynn Haven.....	423,933.93	10,900	38.80	2,005	3	16	3	3	22
Palatka.....	610,000.00	25,000	24.40	1,883	5	12	3	2	17
Neptune Beach.....	178,915.00	5,000	35.80	2,306	6	10	1	3	14
New Port Richey.....	298,000.00	5,000	59.50	1,570	6	10	5	5	20
Hialeah.....	1,625,000.00	-----	-----	3,239	4	14	1	-----	-----
Wildwood.....	90,000.00	1,500	60.00	1,446	2	18	5	5	28
Sanford.....	334,000.00	30,000	11.10	1,496	6	10	5	1	16

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am fundamentally opposed to amendments which would stop much of the progress that is being made against those diseases that tragically and unnecessarily kill and cripple far too many Americans today. These appropriations for the National Institutes of Health are an investment in the future which we cannot afford not to make. We must support medical research now if we are to expect better health and longer life tomorrow.

Although I am concerned with all diseases, I would like to direct my remarks to the problem of cancer.

Many times I have heard people scoff at what they call the lack of progress in cancer. They say we have spent millions of dollars and still do not know what causes cancer or how it can be prevented or cured.

I am sure every one of my colleagues in the House would agree—and I thank God this is true—that the American way is to redouble our efforts in the face of delay and disappointment, rather than to quit because a problem is difficult to resolve. What many people do not know, however, is that tremendous progress has been made. True, scientists do not know the cause of cancer—cancer cannot be prevented as such—and much cancer cannot be effectively treated, particularly if it is discovered late.

But I call to your attention some dramatic facts which were highlighted in this week's *Parade* magazine, in an article by Robert Goldman. The article points out that the knowledge is available to prevent 75,000 of the 242,000 deaths from cancer in this country this year. The studies report that 7 out of 10 patients with cancer of 6 major sites can be cured with early detection and prompt treatment. It reports that there can be a 100 percent cure rate in cancer of the cervix, a form of the disease now fatal to about 13,000 women in this country each year.

Facts such as these prove, it seems to me, that the action we take on these appropriations today is of vital consequence not just to scientists and scientific institutions, but to the people—who have every reason to expect their elected representatives to know their interests and to act affirmatively on their behalf.

I can think of few more shortsighted acts that could be committed by the Congress than to cut back on funds for cancer research at this time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on this floor a few days ago that, I was glad to know that no amendment would be offered to this bill to reduce the amounts requested in this bill for research into the cause and cure of human dread diseases such as cancer, heart, mental, and so forth, and none can now be offered since there is no further opportunity to amend the bill in the House.

H. R. 6287 FALSE ECONOMY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is economy and there is false economy; the first promotes efficiency, the latter cripples and frustrates every legitimate effort to achieve real efficiency. I am fearful that in our understandable zeal to economize on this measure we have overstepped the bounds and taken action

which in ultimate effect is not only relatively insignificant savings, but actually cripples the efficient operation of the several Federal agencies involved.

First, I would allude to the fact that before this bill ever came to the floor of the House, the able committee had already cut over \$118 million from the budget requests submitted by the President. This represented a cut of about 4 percent in the total sought to be appropriated. The House has now cut in an indiscriminate and hasty manner without, it seems to me, that full study and deliberation which I believe should accompany such drastic action, about another \$68 million or something over 2 percent. Therefore the total cut in the committee and the House is about 6 percent.

Now some will say that this is a moderate cut, and I will not deny that in round figures it does not amount to very much of the total sums appropriated. But I submit that it is not the amount; it is the operation affected and the extent of the impairment and crippling of the operation that should be of great concern to us. Two billion dollars might not be a prohibitive cut in the foreign aid programs, but \$200,000 or even \$30,000 might well be a crippling cut in its effect upon the veteran, the worker, the social-security beneficiary or the public health recipient.

And that is just what has happened here. We have saved a few million dollars, but we have jeopardized some very essential services to the American people. The other body will duly note our precipitate action and move to correct it no doubt. It will be for the American people to assess whether we have acted prudently to promote efficiency, or have allowed hasty, indiscriminating considerations to dominate our action.

Some of the items cut are really pica-yune, like the \$30,000 cut in the anti-Communist work in the international labor field which holds such promise of effective action in curbing the migration and the activities of Communist-affiliated labor in other parts of the world that could be so dangerous to our own labor movement if it were through inadvertence and neglect to gain a foothold in this Nation. Thirty thousand dollars seems a small sum indeed to pay for this kind of cooperative intelligence service.

Crippling the Solicitor's Office of the Labor Department where the workload is steadily increasing and the duties so meaningful to management and labor alike is not the kind of economy I desire to approve. It is false economy.

Cutting the funds to aid the physically handicapped and curtailment of vital programs for the veteran is absolutely unjustified by any standard I can accept.

Impairing current programs for coping with unemployment and chronic unemployment areas and the placing of the handicapped with joint State cooperation is another plainly questionable measure which is not economy in any sense of the word. It will have baneful results unless modified in the other body.

Another very ill-advised cut relates to the operation of the Consumer Price In-

dex upon which the wages and livelihood of more than 4 million American workers depends in that their pay scales are geared to this important statistical manual whose accuracy at all times should be unquestioned and cannot operate properly and efficiently with reduced funds.

And similarly unwise, unsound cuts were made in the Wage and Hour Division, the Food and Drug Administration, which polices the purity of the food supply of the American people, the modest appropriation for mentally retarded children, for anti-water pollution work in conjunction with the local communities, a work of such great importance to the public health of the Nation. This latter cut of the entire appropriation, if finally sustained, would completely nullify previous action of the Congress in authorizing this clearly vital public health protection work.

When the time comes I expect to record my interest in economy and efficiency in Government in ways that will be unmistakable and definite. I have already marked out broadly in my mind after careful study the specific areas where I propose to vote to cut the budget. In their entirety these cuts which I intend to support would in the aggregate comprise such huge sums that they would, if adopted by Congress warrant and make possible substantial tax cuts for the American people.

Meanwhile I do not propose to be swept off my feet by hysterical pleas and appeals for indiscriminating, frequently pica-yune and parsimonious cuts that would hamper, impair, or even terminate essential services of Government to the people, to business, to the veteran, to social beneficiaries, to many other worthy and deserving groups and for many worthwhile socially and economically indispensable purposes.

Economy is important. But it must be pursued constructively and fairly and justly.

I am in agreement with the President that we should maintain unimpaired many essential programs, this in the interest of an ordered, forward-moving economy, the social welfare of America and the defense of our shores and our system of Government.

We are living in the most advanced and prosperous era in all history. We have reached a level of plenty and abundance never before approached by man. These high standards are not for special classes alone. They are, in general, for the enjoyment of all Americans who are willing to work and be worthy of them.

At this time of peril, uncertainty and doubt it is not for this Congress to foster policies that will mark a way of retrogression. Our national direction must ever be forward. And we must assume—all of us—public servants and people alike—the burdens of responsibility and obligation which are our privilege, to uphold, protect and advance this great Nation, not in the spirit and grudging manner of penury, but with the vision, breath and completeness necessary to achieve our destiny.

In this quest for stability with progress we can no more ignore the old values than we can overlook the new.

To find the balance between prudence and need in a dynamic economy is a challenge to be sure.

But we can face and solve it best by striking out courageously for the new horizons while never losing sight of the old ones.

Economy without purpose is meaningless; and economy without regard for demonstrable national needs is a shocking and an empty misnomer.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire about the program for the rest of the evening, for tomorrow, and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to give the information to the gentleman. The next order of business today is the District of Columbia appropriation bill. If that bill passes today, as I hope it will, the House will meet tomorrow, but there will be no legislative business.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday there are several bills out of the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 192, Board of Education members may be removed for cause.

H. R. 3400, full and fair disclosure of character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6508, provides for a uniform success of real and personal property in case of intestacy.

H. R. 5893, taxes on vehicles used for drivers training.

H. R. 3486, Uniform Simultaneous Death Act.

H. R. 4874, exempt certain property, Columbia Historical Society.

H. R. 2018, sale of gun mountings and carriages.

H. R. 4840, incorporate Metropolitan Police Relief Association.

H. R. 6306, Fourteenth Street Potomac River Bridge.

After that, the next bill in order would be H. R. 6500, District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1958.

After that, the next bill in order would be the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year 1958. That will continue until disposed of.

Following that there will be H. R. 4136, to extend the Export-Import Bank Act.

For Thursday and the rest of the week:

H. R. 2146, Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

Following that, H. R. 5538, military public lands withdrawals.

The Committee on Rules is meeting on Monday to consider several rules. If they report out any rules, some of those bills may be brought up next week, and I shall announce them just as soon as I possibly can to the membership of the House.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, my remarks appearing in yesterday's RECORD contain a serious error. I ask unanimous consent that I may reprint those remarks with corrections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to not to exceed one-half hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and the other half by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, to consider a bill as important as this in only half an hour is an absurdity. I object.

Mr. RABAUT. How much time would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would suggest we have enough time to consider the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. An hour on each side.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed an hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to that?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That will be 30 minutes on each side?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I object to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, then I again modify my request and ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for not to exceed 2 hours, to be evenly divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana and me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6500, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I desire.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us the District of Columbia appropriation bill making appropriations for the fiscal year 1958. In summary, the bill recommends an appropriation of \$192,530,300 of which \$35,449,000 is for capital outlay. The recommendations before you represent a reduction of \$14,719,600 in the budget estimates and, most important, a reduction of \$5,723,079 below the 1957 appropriations.

For operating expenses the committee has approved \$157,081,300, a reduction of \$2,317,800 in the budget estimates, but an increase of \$6,937,950 above the 1957 funds. But I want to point out here that the increase is \$41,400 less than the amount presented to the committee as mandatory items and these are items such as contribution to the civil service retirement fund, \$1,838,000; increased workload, \$1,839,000; increased Federal obligations such as St. Elizabeths Hospital and contribution for operating of the courts, \$1,411,300; and staffing of new construction for which we have been appropriating the past several years amounts to \$1,062,000.

For capital outlay purposes, the committee recommends \$35,449,000, a reduction of \$12,401,800 in the budget estimates and \$12,661,029 below 1957 appropriations. The Commissioners volunteered a reduction of \$7,821,000 in the highway construction program which the committee accepted without any hesitation. In addition, the committee deleted a number of items that could be called deferrals as testimony presented to the committee indicated that funds for equipment would not be needed for at least another year due to delays in the construction of various projects; in other cases, the committee has allowed funds for plans and specifications for various projects but has denied the construction funds as they would not be needed until the last month or two of the fiscal year. A delay of only a month or two should not hamper the program in any way. The largest reduction in the capital outlay program was the deletion of \$904,000 for a new combination repair shop and fire station in the southwest redevelopment area. The committee has deleted the item as progress of redevelopment of the area is proceeding so slowly that if we were to improve the item, it could be the first new building in the area.

Another item of interest in the bill is the request of the public schools. The committee has provided for 75 additional elementary schoolteachers just to handle the increased population in the schools. In addition, the committee has allowed 68 elementary schoolteachers to enable the school system to take a further step toward reducing the pupil-teacher ratio to its goal of 30 to 1.

Another item that seems to have the attention of the local press is our reduction of \$101,000 in the estimates for the police department. The committee wishes to express its commendation of the work of the department but points out that the Congress authorized last year a force of 2,500 men. The department has been doing some very intensive recruiting since then but has

been only able to increase the force by a net figure of 35 men. The committee wishes to emphasize that it will provide funds for the force as it approaches its authorized strength. In fact, it has provided funds for approximately 2,400 man-years of employment which is 139 man-years over and above the present strength of the force. These extra funds are used for the pay of officers who are voluntarily assigned to work on their days off. This procedure has enabled the department to decrease the crime rate here in the District while the crime rate has been increasing in the rest of the United States.

For the Department of Public Health, the committee has, in effect, approved the budget program. Our attention was directed to the needs of the local hospitals participating in the program of medical care for the indigent population of the District. To help alleviate the financial loss to the participating hospitals, the committee applied \$400,000 of its original reduction of the estimates to this item and has increased the inpatient care and outpatient clinic visit limitation from \$14 to \$16 and \$2.40 to \$3, respectively.

As you no doubt know the committee had an investigation made of the Department of Public Health. The report was so shocking that we decided to have it incorporated in the printed hearings on the bill. One of the items revealed in the report was the fact that a proposed extension of Massachusetts Avenue would run through the hospital grounds. This proposed extension was authorized in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1918 and has hampered the construction program at the hospital since that time. It seems to be good commonsense to repeal this prohibition and I intend to offer an amendment later to accomplish this purpose.

One other item of appropriation that may be of interest is the Federal payment. The budget estimate for this item was \$23 million. The committee has reduced this estimate \$3 million, making the Federal payment to the District \$20 million. This is the same amount as was appropriated last year as the committee could not find any justification for recommending an appropriation of Federal funds to create a surplus in the District treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6500), the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1958, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an announcement. The District of Columbia Appropriation bill will come up for consideration on tomorrow. There is an agreement between the leadership on both sides that if there should be any rollcalls demanded in connection with this bill the rollcalls will be postponed until Monday.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I regret very much this has happened. I have not in 17 years that I have been a Member of this body asked the indulgence of the House because of any appointments I may have had. But I have a 4 o'clock appointment tomorrow to speak before the Indiana Chamber of Commerce at its State Convention being held at French Lick Springs. One of my constituents, Glenn Thompson, is president of that organization and he asked me to come back to make this speech. If the District of Columbia appropriation bill is taken up tomorrow, being the ranking member and being chairman of the subcommittee in the past, I have to be here. I have already sent out my press releases. I hate to ask that consideration of this bill go over, and, as I said, in my 17 years as a Member of this body I have never asked a favor of this House for personal considerations.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts appreciates the position the gentleman from Indiana is in. It was hoped by the leadership that we could dispose of the District of Columbia appropriation bill tonight, recognizing the situation that exists.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I hardly believe that we should take up the Commerce Department bill before Tuesday. It seems to me that it ought to lay over a couple of days. It would seem to me that we could take care of this bill on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts, as majority leader, has to give recognition, and properly so, to the situation that confronts Members and to so program legislation in a manner that takes into consideration, as far as possible, the problems of the Members. I told the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] that the Department of Commerce bill would be the next order of business after disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The gentleman very properly has gone back to his office assuming that this bill would be disposed of today or would come up tomorrow and that consideration of it would be completed and if any rollcalls were necessary they would go over until Monday. In the absence of having talked with him, I would feel as though I was bound through a gentleman's word to him, but, fortunately, the chairman of the Committee on Appro-

priations is on the floor. I have conferred with him and it is agreeable to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], after consultation with him, to have the bill go over until Monday. So, I have something to hang my hat onto, and, accordingly, it is perfectly agreeable to me that that bill be the first order of business on Monday after the disposition of the legislative matters coming out of the District Committee. I hope everybody is happy now.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very kindly for his consideration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the votes taken on amendments to H. R. 6287 I was unavoidably absent from the House Chamber during the votes on the first three. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on the first amendment by Mr. BUDGE, of Idaho; I would have voted "nay" on the second also by Mr. BUDGE of Idaho; on the third by Mr. BUDGE of Idaho I would have voted "nay" also.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, to my desk daily comes a steady stream of letters from aged and needy citizens—not only from my own district, but from all over the country telling of the indignities and oftentimes abuse these people suffer under our public assistance program as it is administered on the State and county level. I have yet to speak at or attend a meeting where these people might be present without hearing the same plea—a plea that Congress should interest itself not only in the financial plight of our needy citizens—and we all know that this is very great indeed—but also in the humane administration of our public assistance program.

After hearing this plea so often repeated, I took it upon myself to do some research into this matter and, I am sorry to say, I found a broad base for the multiplying complaints.

In discussing it with many of my colleagues, I am informed that they face the same daily stream of pitiful letters; that they too find repugnant the manner in which our public-assistance laws are administered in many of our States today.

Upon examining the welfare laws of the 48 States, I have found that in no 2 States are the qualifications for the receipt of aid alike. I have found that a very harsh and drastic means test is imposed in many States which literally strips an applicant or recipient of every last vestige of human dignity. In some

Water may become an enemy instead of a friend. Black blizzards in winter months roar across the Plains, devastating crops and making life a gritty nightmare. Sand dunes at such times begin to march, often covering landmarks and dwellings. Some of the people, unable to withstand this onslaught of nature, leave homes and become wanderers and a social problem. The cause of these dark clouds of distress and despair is a man's heedlessness of the laws of God. Sometimes rivers go on a rampage, bringing destruction and death to many acres. This is a different kind of disaster, but nonetheless it is a result of man's sin against the laws of God. With the earth robbed of its natural coverage of timber, vegetation, and topsoil, the raindrops sent by God to be a blessing find no hold on barren slopes. They tumble rapidly toward the ocean in a terrible torrent that has no respect for life or for property.

The destruction of soil does not decrease the needs of man. God's burden of feeding billions remains the same. If people go hungry, it is not because God is unable to feed His children. It is because God has condescended to use man as His instrument in feeding them.

To the degree that man is a faithful steward and cooperates with God's laws of nature, he is able to satisfy the desires of every living thing. To the degree that man increases the usefulness of a single acre of ground, he extends the hand of God to feed the hungry. To the degree that man decreases the productive power of a single acre of ground, he shortens the hand of God in feeding His children. This places a great responsibility upon the users of the soil.

GOOD SOIL AND GOOD HEALTH

Our health is influenced as much by what the farmer does with his fields as by what the doctor does in his clinic.

Doctors more and more spend their time treating patients for deficiency diseases. Poor nutrition is one of the most important factors in making people susceptible to disease attack, and medical science is finding that prevention in many diseases offers more hope than cure.

Human health begins in the soil. The aim of soil conservation in a major respect is to keep mankind in good health. Health is impossible unless the food mankind eats contains the elements upon which health largely depends. Such food must come from healthy, vigorous, fertile soil.

Soil fertility on any farm can be depleted in a few seasons through failure to return manure, crop residues and other fertility forms. When that happens, it will have changed from a place of health to a place where disease may enter frequently and with persistence.

A human body deficient in iron will likely develop liver disorders, with skin and even the blood becoming pale, and the body becoming gradually emaciated.

A lack of zinc leads to thyroid troubles, and a lack of iodine for any extended period may mean goiter. A deficiency in copper may result in anemia, and a phosphorus deficiency could result in a wasting of body tissues.

Food cannot contain these elements unless they are in the soil to begin with. And the soil must be in a vigorous condition so that the growing plants may make use of the elements the body needs.

The people of this Nation spend many millions of dollars each year in trying to regain health. Much of this goes for vitamins and minerals bought in pills and capsules at the drugstores. Diet should have provided these needs in ample quantity.

Even the foods eaten in a health diet may not be health giving if they are produced on soils which do not contain the elements the human body must have.

Men and animals alike must suffer when the soil suffers through abuse and neglect.

PARTNERS WITH GOD

For too long we have said, "Anyone can farm."

Many are beginning to realize that our economic well-being as a Nation is dependent upon the fertility of the land, but few realize that our physical well-being is also related to the soil.

The farmer or rancher should see himself as a coworker with God. There is more to good farming than scratching the seed into the ground and harvesting whatever grows. There is more to ranching than simply harvesting grass with cattle and sheep. Good farming and ranching mean producing abundantly for the needs of man and at the same time providing for the increasing and continuing productivity of the soil.

A man must have more than the knowledge of new techniques and methods. In him must dwell the right spirit. He must have a deep sense of his responsibility to God and fellow man. He must have a love for the land. He must find pleasure in growing things and feel a hurt when a field is wounded by abuse or wrong judgment.

When men with this spirit live on the land, God's countryside flourishes with prosperity, contentment, and good will. Farm families find pleasure in the sight of well-kept fields and farmyards.

The products of the field are not considered as ends in themselves, but rather the means for sustaining happy family life. Schools and churches that adequately meet the need of the community are written large in people's minds. There is a healthy flow of farm produce to the market place. The entire country flourishes as farmer, businessman, professional men, craftsmen, and laborers exchange services with a sincere desire that each be adequately rewarded for his contribution to the well-being of the community.

Soil is the backbone of the Nation. Cities may be destroyed, but they will be rebuilt if the people's spirit is strong and natural resources are available. But no city has been built in a desert.

TOMORROW'S STEWARDSHIP

In any area of living it is a bad situation if the older generation does not bequeath to its children something richer and something better. However, some things can be corrected in a very short time. This is not so with soil and water. The mistakes and wrongs committed today against these precious natural resources in many instances will take hundreds of years to correct, and in others, restoration will never be possible.

The richness of America's soil and the plentitude of water will be reflected in the prosperity, the wealth, and the spirit of tomorrow's people far more than is generally believed. It has truly been said that "the soil is God's greatest material gift to mankind." This generation's greatest material gifts to tomorrow's world will be a productive soil and adequate water resources. Stewardship demands that we prepare, conserve, replenish, and protect these resources.

Urban and country youth should be conscious of the importance of soil and water in their everyday living and in their future. Soil and water play a vital role in the physical, economic, social, and religious life of the individual, the community, the Nation, and the world. This fact needs to be stressed so that the importance of soil and water is integrated into every phase of education—school, church, and youth organizations—both rural and urban.

Youth has a great stake in this effort. The time and energy that the young people spend in putting soil and water conservation programs into practice can be their best investment in their future.

RESPONSIBILITY OF LANDOWNERSHIP

The man-land relationship is a necessary part of God's universal scheme. In the Garden of Eden, God made man a steward of the land and responsible to Him for its care and use.

The Biblical message is clear and emphatic on land use and distribution. A man's inheritance of land was to be held, as nearly as possible, inviolate. Hear Elijah's judgment against Ahab when he would take Naboth's vineyard: "Have you killed and also taken possession?" (I Kings 21: 19.) Micah sets forth the prophetic ideal, "They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid." (Micah 4: 4.)

God's greatest material gift to man is a very special kind of property, containing the basic sources of food, fiber, and fuel for man's use. Ownership of whatever sort, owner-operator, landlord or tenant, involves utilization of one's property to serve the highest purpose of human development and welfare. In many instances, absentee-owners fail to accept their responsibility as stewards of the soil. A special effort must be put forth to remind the absentee-owner of his moral responsibility. Profits made at the expense of soil jeopardize the local community and are made at the expense of the Nation.

In the exercise of his ownership of the land, a good owner develops a just pride in his acres, and is actively involved in the improvement of the attractiveness and the productivity of his acres. He comes to feel himself a part of the continuing creative process working cooperatively with God, "maintaining the yield," contributing to human welfare. Land ownership consciousness results in the conservation and the improvement of the God-given soil, and at the same time yields social satisfactions to the farmer, his family, his neighbors, and the world at large.

Such ownership eventuates in responsible citizenry and Christian stewards of the land. This kind of ownership should be transmitted from generation to generation. Farm families have a significant opportunity in father-son agreements. The son inherits the land and the soil stewardship practices of his father. The land of such a farm is conserved and enriched for future generations.

GIVE THANKS TO GOD

Through the ages man has been conscious of the need to give thanks to Almighty God for His bountiful blessings.

The word "rogation" comes from the Latin word "rogare" meaning "to ask." The 3 Rogations Days are over 1,500 years old. They began in the fifth century at Vienne, France, when in the year 470 there had been crop failures—due to earthquakes and bad weather—with resulting famine. St. Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, ordered prayer and penance on the 3 days preceding the Ascension. The clergy and the people made penitential processions calling upon God to help and asking His intercession.

Other communities took up the custom, and from France it soon spread throughout the world. At the end of the eighth century it was formally accepted by the church. Thus, it has become the practice to hold each year before Ascension Thursday a special Rogation service.

The purpose of the Rogation Day is to implore the mercy of God that He may keep us from all evils of soul and body, and give to the plants of the field an increase. In the spring, when the fields are becoming green and there is promise of a good harvest—but also the possibility of destruction through frost, hail, or rainstorms—the prayers and processions are a reminder to feeble man to turn with humility and confi-

dence to the Giver of all good. For, it is not the earth alone which brings forth fruit, and not alone the busy hand of man on which the increase depends; but it is God who gives the increase.

Each year thousands of people participate in soil-stewardship services and Rogation Day prayers in city, village, and open country churches. This is a tremendous demonstration of man's desire to give thanks to God and to ask for continued blessings.

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1958

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1957

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island and I have disagreed at various points throughout this bill but I hope that he will be in agreement with me on this amendment which relates to additional salaries to carry out the program on which the Committee of the Whole House just voted. As near as I can determine, there are about \$100,000 in salaries carried for the Bureau of Public Assistance to carry out this program of training welfare personnel. That program was just defeated on a division vote. I would hope that the gentleman from Rhode Island will accept this amendment. It certainly should be adopted in view of the fact that the program for which the expenditure was to be made and for which the salaries were to be paid is not carried in the appropriation bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It is my understanding only \$99 million have been made available and that they need \$105 million. Unless we provide the money we will not be keeping faith with the several States; is that not true?

Mr. BUDGE. That, of course, would not apply to the amendment which I have offered, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the gentleman's amendment was to put in this bill the amount that is short in the other bill?

Mr. BUDGE. No, that is not correct. The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina would have restored \$2½ million for the training of personnel.

Mr. COOLEY. I know that.

Mr. BUDGE. There is now in the amendment which I have offered \$100,-

000 which is carried in the bill and should not be in the bill because it is to pay the salaries of the people who were to set up this training program to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. COOLEY. One hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. BUDGE. One hundred thousand dollars and the bill should be reduced by that amount because the purpose for which the \$100,000 is in there was eliminated by the Appropriations Committee and that action has been sustained by the vote just a few minutes ago.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say for the benefit of the gentleman who made the inquiry that I have been advised by a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that the item I just introduced and which my amendment relates to did originate in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BUDGE. Be that as it may, in view of the fact that the \$2½ million for this purpose is not carried in the bill, then \$100,000 should not be carried to pay the salaries of the people who were to set the program in operation.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought that the whole \$2½ million was to pay the salaries or scholarships or provide a program for the training of personnel?

Mr. BUDGE. I may say to the gentleman that the amendment which he offered would have done that, but since the amendment was not adopted and since there are no funds in the bill for that program, we should eliminate \$100,000 to pay the Federal salaries to put the program in operation.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is probably right.

Administrative Costs for Public Assistance in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1957

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, an erroneous impression has been created in this House, possibly inadvertently, as to the cost of administration of public assistance in the State of New York. The statement has been made here that these costs run as high as 27 percent of expenditures.

In fairness to the administrators of my State, and for the sake of accuracy, I ask leave to include in the RECORD the following facts and figures.

First, it should be borne in mind that there are many service costs blanketed under the heading of administrative costs in New York State—services which are not made available to welfare clients in some other States. Among these are casework service, medical service to restore people to physical health, guidance to children, homemaker service, and so on. In other words, the department of social welfare is not merely a fund-dispensing agency, but renders many

services which are designed to curb and lighten the burden of indigency both on the clients and on the public. It might be desirable to separate these service costs from administrative costs so that a clearer public accounting could be rendered as to the use of these funds. In the absence of such separation, the public and the Congress may be misled.

Even taking these added services and activities into account, New York State's administrative costs do not, in fact, approach 27 percent of expenditures, as charged.

In fiscal 1956, the latest year for which full figures are available, New York State spent \$273,505,014 on federally aided assistance programs. Of this sum, \$236,197,416 was for assistance, and \$37,307,598 went to administrative costs. Thus the percentage of the total sum expended for what are presently labeled as administrative costs was 13.6 percent. Broken down as between New York City and upstate, here are the figures: New York City expended a total of \$182,533,685, of which \$155,478,753 went for assistance and \$27,054,932 was expended for administration. This amounts to 14.8 percent for administration. In the upstate counties and cities, the expenditures for assistance amounted to \$90,971,329, of which \$80,718,663 went for assistance and \$10,252,666 was allotted to administration—amounting to 11.3 percent for administration. The reason for the higher percentage of administrative costs in New York City is that there is a higher rate of turnover and a much higher rate of applications than exists in the upstate areas.

Soil-Bank Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1957

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial written by Mr. Albert M. James, editor of the Syracuse Journal, of Syracuse, Kans. This editorial appeared in the Syracuse Journal for March 21, 1957:

SOIL-BANK PAYMENTS

Properly administered, and working as it was intended, the soil-bank program is as near ideal for drought-damaged Hamilton County as any plan that can be devised. It provides a substantial income for both landowner and tenant, without the senseless expense of planting a wheat crop under conditions that prohibit it making a crop, which was the biggest objection to the former acreage allotment plan.

But this plan is now in grave danger of causing great harm to the community through a squabble about who gets the Federal payments. There is no rebuttal to the argument that if tenant farmers are dispossessed from land, there will be great loss of population here, a loss which will be reflected immediately in business activity, and continue for several years of adjustment after conditions permit wheat raising again.

Actually there have been few attempts reported on the part of landlords to dispossess or raise the rent on tenants in order to get a larger share of the soil-bank payments. Most of them are going along with the program as it was intended, but the few instances already known point out the danger. If a few are successful in their efforts, they may be followed by many, and in a county so largely nonresident owned as is Hamilton, this would be disastrous.

What the outcome will be cannot be foretold at this time. It will not be known until after the applications are presented for the 1958 soil-bank program. The local ASC committee has a hard job ahead of it.

Here clearly is a conflict of human rights against property rights. When he is not farming, the landlord has little need for a tenant, and the tenant's share of the soil-bank payments is a tempting morsel. But the tenant who has fought dust and dry weather for the past several years, and lost money doing it, also has rights. He cannot remain idle like the land. He has spent years of hard work on the land, believing it was his to farm as long as he did a good job. He should not be deprived of this interest.

In such conflicts, we believe the human rights should have precedence over the property rights. The soil-bank program is for farm relief, not landlord relief.

Humanitarian and Old-Age Rights Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1957

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined nearly 50 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives and Senate in sponsoring the Humanitarian and Old-Age Rights Act, a measure which will be welcomed by millions of our Nation's less-fortunate citizens.

Since enactment of the public assistance section of the Social Security Act, there has been reason to question the degree of humanity and justice with which the provisions of this act have been administered. The responsibility of Congress, Mr. Speaker, goes beyond the adequacy of financial assistance to needy Americans. We must also safeguard those receiving assistance from undue harassment and intimidation and restore to them their right to human dignity.

The Humanitarian and Old-Age Rights Act is a step in this direction. By establishing a single standard of qualifications for the applicants and recipients of public assistance—below which no State shall go—a degree of uniformity would be achieved among the widely varying laws of the 48 States.

For the first time a legislative intent would be established by Congress "that public assistance shall be administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life, and without discrimination on account of race, sex, religion, or political affiliation; and the assistance laws shall be liberally construed."

Among the outstanding provisions of this bill are the following:

The age requirement for recipients of old-age assistance would be the same as that of retired workers receiving social-security benefits.

The aged and handicapped on public assistance would be allowed to earn up to \$50 a month; the parents of needy children up to \$30 per month, and the needy children themselves, up to \$30 per month to supplement their assistance checks. The blind are already permitted to earn \$50 without penalty of reduction in aid.

Recipients may own a home of an assessed value—less all encumbrances—up to \$5,000 free from the imposition of a lien. The floor of \$1,200 is established under the amount of personal property which a single recipient is allowed to have, and household furnishings are exempt, as are insurance policies or burial agreements up to \$500 in value.

The practice of enforcing collections from the relatives of recipients and the publishing of the names of recipients is prohibited, and no person receiving public aid shall be deemed a pauper or referred to as being indigent.

The State-imposed residence requirement now allowed by the Federal Government would be reduced from 5 years to 1 year, and persons otherwise qualified who do not meet State residence requirements shall receive partial payments directly from the Federal Government until the State residence requirement has been met.

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1958

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1957

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, since the gentleman from Rhode Island has referred to rollcalls either tonight or tomorrow, if he would indicate to us just what amendments he intends to demand rollcalls on. Now, I have offered 5 amendments to this bill, all of which have been adopted, and I would like to know which ones the gentleman intends to call the roll on.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the first one would be the Smith amendment cutting the solicitor's office.

The second one would be the one bearing the gentleman's name, called the Budge amendment, which cuts the veterans. The third would be the Smith amendment cutting the Bureau of Employment Security. The fourth, the

Murray amendment, is a cut dealing with the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Fifth, the Anderson amendment cutting the Women's Bureau. The sixth would be the Hébert amendment cutting the Wage and Hour Division. The seventh would be the Jonas amendment cutting the Food and Drug Administration. The eighth would be the Dorn amendment cutting the Department of Education. Ninth is the Fisher amendment deleting \$50 million for grants for waste treatment works construction.

We will have to wait until the end of the bill to see if we have any others. I have the gentleman down for one.

Mr. BUDGE. Well, that is the reason I asked the question. It places the authors of the amendments in rather a peculiar position when you want to call the roll on some of the amendments, and when they are all on the same theory. Would it not be proper to assume, from a reading of the amendments that the gentleman is seeking a rollcall on, that he favors the other amendments?

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, no. I was just trying to save the time of the House. But I have all this week and next week, and if you desire to have a rollcall on some of these smaller amendments, I will be very happy to cooperate with you.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that I certainly do not want to drag this matter out any longer than is necessary, but when five amendments are adopted, all of which propose the same thing, I cannot quite understand why the gentleman is so selective as to pick out only one bearing my name and leaving out the others. Is there some difference in the others?

Mr. FOGARTY. What are some of the others? Will the gentleman refresh my recollection? Maybe I have forgotten one or two.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, it may work out that we would be constrained as the authors of the amendments to ask for a rollcall on all of them rather than just permit the gentleman from Rhode Island to pick out the ones he feels most sympathetic to.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is the gentleman's prerogative. I have given the House notice of what I intend to do as chairman of this subcommittee in the matter of asking for rollcalls on amendments. I hope that there will be a sufficient number of Members on this side and on the gentleman's side to get a rollcall. If the gentleman has any other amendments in mind on which he wants to get a rollcall, I shall be happy to cooperate with him in that regard.

Mr. BUDGE. I should like the gentleman, if he is going to ask for a rollcall on any other amendments that I have offered, all of which were intended to retain personnel at the present level, to ask for a rollcall on each of them instead of picking out one that happens to bear my name, toward which he seems to be sympathetic.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would suggest to the gentleman that he ask for a rollcall on any amendment he has in mind. I

have mentioned the ones that I think are important and that I think the membership would want to vote on. I have made my selection. If the gentleman wants to add any to those, I shall cooperate with him.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having had this colloquy with the gentleman from Rhode Island because it would help explain an action which we, as authors of these amendments, may feel constrained to take if the gentleman proceeds in the manner which he has outlined.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman, I am going to proceed in exactly the manner I have just outlined.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, can we learn what time this day of judgment begins tomorrow and what the schedule of voting will be?

The CHAIRMAN. That announcement will come from the leadership.

Spanish War Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1957

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as is well-known to the veterans of all wars among whom the National Tribune is regarded as an outstanding spokesman for the veterans of the country, the eighth page of this fine newspaper is devoted to news of interest to the United Spanish War Veterans. On this page of the issue of April 4, 1957, appears the following plea for prompt action on the Spanish War widows pension bill, just approved unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Good news has come from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 358, the O'Hara bill to grant increased pension for widows of Spanish-American War veterans, has been approved by the committee and now goes before the House of Representatives for a vote.

The fact that the House committee has approved it is a good sign and promises favorable consideration by the House as a whole. However, this is no time to loaf on the job. Every Spanish-American War veteran—in fact every war veteran—should express to his Representative in Congress the need for its prompt passage.

Early approval by the House should insure its consideration by the Senate at an early date and not die in a Senate pigeonhole as has happened in previous Congresses.

While there is surely a need for economy in Government spending such economy should not be made in the case of the needy widows of Spanish-American War veterans who have been compelled to exist on the pittance they are now receiving.

To use the slogan of politicians: "Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid

of their party?" The party is the group of widows of the veterans of 1898-1902 and the time is now. A call for action should meet a prompt and favorable response. Let's go.

Proctor Band Wins Cherry Blossom Festival Band Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1957

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and great pleasure that I am able to announce that the winner of the Cherry Blossom Festival national high-school band competition held yesterday was the Proctor High School Band of Proctor, Minn.

These 72 young musicians, under the leadership of Band Director J. P. Moody and Assistant Director R. J. Melde, took first place in the playing-band category, second place in the marching-band category, and were named "best all-around band."

This is not the first long trip experienced by the now nationally known Proctor High School Band. In 1948 the band played at the Little Rose Bowl game in Pasadena, Calif. In 1948 it played in Winnipeg, Canada, and in 1950 the band traveled to the Portland, Oreg., Festival of Roses. Recently the band has performed in New Orleans' Mardi Gras parade and just recently made a fine appearance during the intermission in the Orange Bowl game in Miami Beach, Fla. I am sure the 1957 Proctor band can take its place with fine Proctor bands of the past and can add now, to its many honors already won, the title of best band at the Washington, D. C., Cherry Blossom Festival for 1957.

Proctor High School is one of the finest schools in northern Minnesota which is known for its many fine schools. Congratulations should be extended to the band director, Mr. Moody, and his assistant, Mr. Melde, as well as the very able educator, Superintendent A. J. Jedlicka, who accompanied the band, and Mr. W. R. Salmi, assistant superintendent.

A list of the band members includes: Sharyn Torba, Joan Moran, Diane Davis, Bertha Fransk, Jane Perrill, Annette Wiggins, Carol Malley, Louann Frolen, Nancy Burlovich, Joyce Pelletier, Sandra Soderberg, Nancy Stickney, Joan Haugen, JoAnn Traplay, Rosemary Timmerman, Wendy Lambert, Marilyn Sheehan, Deanne Oppel, Carolyn Carlson, Sharon Hoffman, Pat Norlund, Sharon Parsons, Doris Moen, Charlene Sedor, Clarice Anderson, Dorothy Larson, Charlene Brockway, Sandra Hoffman, Mary Jo Bijold, Carol Chapman, Donna Renaud, Jeanine Johnson, Marion Sauter, Margaret Norstrom, Judy Stickney, Donna Lee, Karen Breimon, Carol Stack, Roberta Mehling, Sharon Carlson, Judy Wolff, Kay Johnson, Sandy Lambert, Julia Denzler, Jane

Johnson, Marilyn Gulbranson, Karen Nelson, Mary Lynn Johnson, Joan Wagner, Nancy Stewart, Barbara Mehling, Margaret Skog, Barbara Jugasek, Diane Beatty, Susan Granmoe, Corinne Robertson, Janice Wedlund, Sharon Barlow, Jean Sowa, John Breigenzer, Ronald Barlow, Joe Spencer, Victor Breemeersch, Jim Parmeter, Jon Parmeter, Duan Benoit, Dale Hoffman, Dan Quaderer, Roger Dahl, Duane Sedor, Harvey Burski, Butch Traplay.

The Financial Institutions Act—S. 1451

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1957

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following unsolicited letter, dated March 30, 1957, and written by John A. Schoonover, president of the Idaho First National Bank, Boise, Idaho:

THE IDAHO FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Boise, Idaho, March 30, 1957.

The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Member, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: The Financial Institutions Act, S. 1451, which is now being considered by your committee, deserves close attention. Generally speaking, this is a desired codification of a mass of Federal laws pertaining to banks and other financial institutions.

I do, however, wish to point out that chapter 4 of the Federal Reserve Act portion of the law includes a provision which would alter the procedures pertaining to the election of directors of the separate 12 Federal Reserve banks. The new law would limit such directors to two 3-year terms, and would, in effect, deprive the member banks of their right and privilege to elect their chosen representatives as class A and B directors of the various district Federal Reserve banks.

It is felt that this statutory limitation is inimical to the best interests of the member banks, and we find our position in this respect has been supported by a number of respected authorities. In a letter dated November 5, 1956, the Federal Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve System indicated opposition to such a restriction. The Association of Reserve City Bankers has evidenced its opposition, as has the special American Bankers Association's committee set up to assist in the preparation and study of the entire Financial Institutions Act.

The existing law and regulations provide for secret voting for directors of the classes A and B, which in itself should obviate the necessity of any new statutory limitation. It appears unwise to eliminate Federal Reserve bank directors who are recognized and experienced authorities, and who, at the same time, are capably and suitably representing the banks which elected them.

As this bill moves through your committee and onto the floor of the House, it would be sincerely appreciated if you would give this particular aspect your careful attention.

Yours very truly,

JOHN A. SCHOONOVER,
President.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6287

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 8, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and
6 related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958,
7 namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; and purchase of uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); \$1,480,000, of which not more than \$170,000 shall be for international labor affairs.

Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet, in whole or in part, the requirements of the Department; and (4) telephone, mail and messenger services: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order on June 30, 1957, shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That the fund may be used to finance the cost of centralized procurement

1 of supplies and equipment and that the fund shall be reim-
2 bursed in advance from available funds of bureaus, offices,
3 and agencies for which services are performed at rates which
4 will return in full all expenses of operations, including re-
5 serves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equip-
6 ment.

7 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
9 Office of the Solicitor, \$2,021,000, together with not to ex-
10 ceed \$365,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund
11 created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of
12 1956.

13 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
15 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and
16 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-
17 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Fed-
18 eral Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C.
19 784 (c)) ; performance of the functions vested in the Sec-
20 retary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act,
21 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not less than
22 \$182,575 for the work of the President's Committee on
23 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as
24 authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat.
25 409) : *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for

1 the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or
2 transfer to any other department or agency under the pro-
3 visions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and
4 of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attend-
5 ance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences
6 concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards;
7 \$985,000.

8 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render
10 assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment
11 rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service
12 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the
13 Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended (50 U. S. C.
14 App. 351), the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel
15 Service Law of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 401),
16 and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service
17 Act (50 U. S. C. App. 459), and the Reserve Forces Act
18 of 1955 (69 Stat. 598), \$542,000.

19 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
21 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
22 tice training, as authorized by the Acts of March 4, 1913 (5
23 U. S. C. 611), and August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50),
24 \$3,600,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$5,558,000, of which \$1,125,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment, and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses including purchasing and installing of air-conditioning equipment in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of

1 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
2 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Read-
3 justment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684) and title
4 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1130),
5 \$249,814,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision
6 to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security
7 Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time
8 to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment
9 to each State found to be in compliance with the require-
10 ments of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of
11 Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, with the provi-
12 sions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended,
13 such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper
14 and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation
15 law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*,
16 That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Depart-
17 ment of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used
18 for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly
19 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail
20 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-
21 ment compensation systems and employment services by
22 States receiving grants herefrom.

23 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
24 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
25 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and

1 maintenance of personnel standards on the merit basis, shall
2 apply.

3 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
4 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
5 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
6 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
7 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
8 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
9 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
10 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
11 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
12 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
13 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
14 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

15 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
16 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
17 to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as
18 amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended,
19 for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such
20 sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
21 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
22 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
23 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

24 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
25 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of

1 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
2 \$36,800,000.

3 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
4 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
5 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV of
6 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
7 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
8 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
9 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
10 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

11 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees:
12 For payments to unemployed Federal employees, either di-
13 rectly or through payments to States, as authorized by title
14 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$25,000,000.

15 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees,
16 next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of
17 the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized
18 by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, such
19 amounts as may be required for payment to unemployed
20 Federal employees for the first quarter of the next succeeding
21 fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder
22 shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal
23 year.

24 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
25 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to

1 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under
2 the Act of July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119), as amended,
3 including temporary employment of persons without regard
4 to the civil service laws, \$2,236,200.

5 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

6 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
7 expenses and not to exceed \$113,400 for the Employees'
8 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,838,000, together with
9 not to exceed \$47,400 to be derived from the fund created
10 by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers'
11 Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906).

12 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
13 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-
14 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
15 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
16 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
17 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau
18 of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of
19 benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War
20 Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation
21 Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of
22 recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical
23 and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral
24 and burial expenses, including transportation and other ex-

1 penses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial,
2 for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were
3 certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital
4 services and treatment at Government expense on June 30,
5 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian
6 employees of the United States, and the limitations and
7 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended
8 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,
9 treatment, and expenses in such cases and for payments pur-
10 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act
11 of 1948 (50 U. S. C., app. 2012) ; such amount as may be
12 required during the current fiscal year.

13 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
15 work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances
16 or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and
17 their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed
18 \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
19 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$7,124,000.

20 WOMEN'S BUREAU

21 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
22 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of

1 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of
2 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$462,000.

3 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
5 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
6 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions
7 for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by
8 the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended
9 (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State,
10 Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection
11 services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of
12 attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-
13 ferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$10,-
14 600,000.

15 GENERAL PROVISIONS

16 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
17 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
18 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
19 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and for expenses of attendance at meetings
20 concerned with the function or activity for which any such
21 appropriation is made.

22 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
23 Appropriation Act, 1958".

1 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCA-
2 TION, AND WELFARE

3 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

4 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
5 March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101–105),
6 \$328,000.

7 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

8 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carry-
9 ing out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as
10 amended (21 U. S. C. 301–392) ; the Tea Importation Act,
11 as amended (21 U. S. C. 41–50) ; the Import Milk Act
12 (21 U. S. C. 141–149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act
13 (15 U. S. C. 401–411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as
14 amended (21 U. S. C. 61–64) ; reporting and illustrating
15 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-
16 ratus, and scientific equipment; payment in advance for
17 special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees,
18 travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new
19 developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement
20 operations; \$9,300,000.

21 Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and
22 other services: For expenses necessary for the certification
23 or inspection of certain products, and for the establishment
24 of tolerances for pesticides, in accordance with sections 406,
25 408, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal

1 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.
2 346, 346a, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the ag-
3 gregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal
4 year to cover payments of fees for services in connec-
5 tion with such certifications, inspections, or establishment of
6 tolerances, to remain available until expended. The total
7 amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal
8 services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific
9 equipment; expenses of advisory committees; and the refund
10 of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered.

11 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

12 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for oper-
13 ation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repair-
14 ing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in
15 the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to
16 the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard Univer-
17 sity" for salaries of technical and professional personnel de-
18 tailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of
19 Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power
20 furnished by such university; \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That
21 no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from
22 this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive com-
23 pensation in the form of wages or salary from any other
24 appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the
25 District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's

1 Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance
2 at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the
3 Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of
4 rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of
5 patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered
6 by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations
7 shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of
8 payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been
9 paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be
10 made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the
11 Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed
12 upon him by the foregoing proviso.

13 GALLAUDET COLLEGE

14 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Gal-
15 laudet College, including personal services and miscellaneous
16 expenses, and repairs and improvements, as authorized by
17 the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law 420), \$730,000:
18 *Provided*, That Gallaudet College shall be paid by the
19 District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each
20 quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per school year for each
21 student attending and receiving instruction in elementary
22 or secondary education pursuant to the Act of March 1,
23 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

24 Construction: For the construction and equipment of

1 buildings and facilities on the grounds of Gallaudet College,
2 as authorized by the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law
3 420), under the supervision of the General Services Admin-
4 istration, including planning, architectural, and engineering
5 services, \$1,690,000, to remain available until June 30,
6 1959, as follows: For a cafeteria and service building and a
7 men's dormitory, together with alterations, installations, and
8 equipment in connection with such construction, and for
9 beginning roads, walks, and grading in connection with such
10 construction.

11 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

12 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
13 Howard University, including personal services and mis-
14 cellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
15 \$3,800,000.

16 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans
17 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of
18 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of How-
19 ard University, of a physical education building and a home
20 economics building, \$150,000, to remain available until
21 June 30, 1959.

22 Construction of buildings: For equipping the dental
23 school building under the supervision of General Services
24 Administration, \$262,000, to remain available until June

1 30, 1959, and such amount shall be in addition to the
2 limitation of cost established by Public Law 452, Eighty-
3 second Congress.

4 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

5 Promotion and further development of vocational edu-
6 cation: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
7 Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20
8 U. S. C., ch. 2), and section 202 of said Act (70 Stat. 925),
9 section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29),
10 section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30),
11 the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31), including
12 \$4,000,000 for extension and improvement of practical nurse
13 training, \$33,442,081: *Provided*, That the apportionment
14 to the States under section 3 (a), (1), (2), (3), and (4)
15 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed
16 on the basis of not to exceed \$29,267,081 for the current
17 fiscal year.

18 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
19 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section
20 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C.
21 329), \$2,501,500.

22 Grants for library services: For grants to the States
23 pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1956, as amended (70 Stat.
24 293-296, 911), \$5,000,000.

25 Payments to school districts: For payments to local edu-

1 cational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
2 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as
3 amended (20 U. S. C. ch. 13; 70 Stat. 909, 970-972),
4 \$127,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also
5 be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of
6 such Act.

7 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
8 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
9 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized
10 by title III and title IV of the Act of September 23, 1950,
11 as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14; 70 Stat. 909, 968-969),
12 including not to exceed \$700,000 for necessary expenses of
13 technical services rendered by other agencies and not to
14 exceed \$5,000,000 for title IV, \$41,700,000, to remain
15 available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That no part of
16 this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
17 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and
18 Welfare.

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
20 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations,
21 and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of
22 public and school library service; coordination of library
23 service on the national level with other forms of adult educa-
24 tion; developing library participation in Federal projects;

1 fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among
2 libraries, interstate library coordination and the development
3 of library service throughout the country; purchase, distri-
4 bution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
5 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
6 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
7 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
8 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
9 and repairing the same; and cooperative research, surveys,
10 and demonstrations in education as authorized by the Act of
11 July 26, 1954 (20 U. S. C. 331-332) ; \$7,000,000, of
12 which not less than \$550,000 shall be available for the
13 Division of Vocational Education as authorized.

14 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

15 Grants to States and other agencies: For grants to
16 States and other agencies in accordance with the Voca-
17 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$45,100,000, of which
18 \$40,000,000 is for vocational rehabilitation services under
19 section 2 of said Act; \$1,500,000 is for extension and im-
20 provement projects under section 3 of said Act; and
21 \$3,600,000 is for special projects under section 4 of said
22 Act: *Provided*, That allotments under section 2 of said Act
23 to the States for the current fiscal year shall be made on
24 the basis of \$53,000,000, and this amount shall be con-

1 sidered the sum available for allotments under such section
2 for such fiscal year.

3 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
4 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, grants to States
5 under sections 2 and 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
6 as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding
7 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
8 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged
9 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*,
10 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall
11 not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter
12 of the current fiscal year.

13 Training and traineeships: For training and traineeships
14 pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
15 as amended, and for carrying out the training functions
16 provided for in section 7 of said Act, \$4,400,000.

17 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
18 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
19 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), as amended, \$1,330,000.

21 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

22 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
23 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
24 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, in-

1 cluding expenses for active commissioned officers in the
2 Reserve Corps and for not to exceed one thousand six
3 hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps;
4 and except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September
5 30, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 236-244), for expenses of primary
6 and secondary schooling of dependents of Public Health
7 Service personnel stationed in foreign countries, in amounts
8 not to exceed an average of \$250 per student, when it is
9 determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, avail-
10 able in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the
11 education of such dependents, and for the transportation
12 of such dependents between such schools and their places
13 of residence when the schools are not accessible to such
14 dependents by regular means of transportation; and for
15 the payment of compensation to consultants or individual
16 scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to
17 section 207 (e) or section 207 (f) of the Act at rates
18 established by the Surgeon General not to exceed \$15,000
19 per annum; as follows:

20 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
21 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c)
22 of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pur-
23 suant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations
24 and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; to
25 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,

1 and vital statistics; to provide traineeships pursuant to sec-
2 tion 306 of the Act; and not to exceed \$1,000 for enter-
3 tainment of officials of other countries when specifically
4 authorized by the Surgeon General; \$19,592,000.

5 Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska: To en-
6 able the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to
7 cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the con-
8 duct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention,
9 treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and
10 maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to
11 and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314
12 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f),
13 (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c)
14 of such section), 361, 363, and 371 of the Act, including
15 the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the
16 purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings,
17 \$2,165,000.

18 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
19 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
20 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
21 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
22 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
23 ment; and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act,
24 and with the approval of the respective State health author-

ities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine; \$4,415,000.

Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (b) of the Act, \$7,000,000, of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria.

Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as otherwise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$6,200,000.

Sanitary engineering activities: For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, in-

1 including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and inter-
2 state quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the pur-
3 poses of the Acts of July 14, 1955 (Public Law 159), and
4 July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), including \$2,700,000 for
5 grants to States and \$300,000 for grants to interstate agen-
6 cies; and the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;
7 \$12,640,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958.

8 Grants for waste treatment works construction: For
9 payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control
10 Act, as amended, \$50,000,000, to remain available only
11 until June 30, 1959.

12 Grants for hospital construction: For payments under
13 parts C and G, title VI, of the Act, as amended, \$121,-
14 200,000, of which \$99,000,000 shall be for payments for
15 hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,200,-
16 000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636 of
17 the Act, and \$21,000,000 shall be for payments for facili-
18 ties pursuant to part G, as follows: \$6,500,000 for diag-
19 nostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the
20 chronically ill and impaired, \$4,000,000 for rehabilitation
21 facilities, and \$4,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided*, That
22 allotments under such parts C and G to the several States
23 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of
24 amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

25 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:

1 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
2 of the Act, as amended, \$1,450,000.

3 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
4 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August
5 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), under the Dependents' Medical
6 Care Act (70 Stat. 250-254), and under sections 307, 321,
7 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and
8 810 of the Public Health Service Act, Private Law 419
9 of the Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and Executive
10 Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and
11 exchange of farm products and livestock; conducting research
12 on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative
13 nursing services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;
14 \$44,399,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively avail-
15 able for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and
16 treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That
17 when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a
18 health service program for any department or agency, pay-
19 ment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for
20 deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

21 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
22 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-
23 ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
24 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
25 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of

1 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
2 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
3 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-
4 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
5 required by law of such countries, \$3,876,000.

6 Indian health activities: For expenses necessary to enable
7 the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of
8 August 5, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 2001), including services as
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
10 U. S. C. 55a) (including not to exceed \$10,000 for such
11 services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals,
12 when authorized by the Surgeon General) ; hire of passenger
13 motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment
14 for telephone service in private residences in the field, when
15 authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and
16 the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public
17 Health Service Act; \$40,000,000.

18 Construction of Indian health facilities: For construc-
19 tion, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health
20 and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for per-
21 sonnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings;
22 acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable build-
23 ings; and purchase of trailers; \$3,096,000, to remain avail-
24 able until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That such expenditures
25 may be made through the Department of the Interior at

1 the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health,
2 Education, and Welfare.

3 National Institutes of Health, general research and
4 services: For the activities of the National Institutes of
5 Health, not otherwise provided for, including research
6 fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to sec-
7 tion 301 of the Act; regulation and preparation of biologic
8 products, and conduct of research related thereto; not to ex-
9 ceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when
10 specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of
11 temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chem-
12 ical substances for demonstrations and research; \$14,026,000.

13 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
14 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
15 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
16 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
17 State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit
18 institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of
19 cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations,
20 and grants-in-aid; and to contract for supplies and services
21 by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Re-
22 vised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy pro-
23 gram; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title
24 IV, part A, of the Act; \$46,902,000.

25 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for

1 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 304,
2 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental
3 diseases, \$35,217,000.

4 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
5 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
6 \$33,436,000.

7 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
8 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
9 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
10 diseases and conditions, \$6,430,000.

11 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
12 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
13 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$17,885,000.

14 Allergy and infectious disease activities: For expenses,
15 not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the pur-
16 poses of the Act relating to allergy and infectious diseases,
17 \$17,400,000, of which \$150,000 shall be available for pay-
18 ment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and
19 operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

20 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-
21 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
22 neurology and blindness, \$18,887,000.

23 Grants for construction of health research facilities: For
24 grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of
25 1956, \$30,000,000.

1 National Library of Medicine: For expenses, not other-
2 wise provided for, necessary to carry out the National
3 Library of Medicine Act (70 Stat. 960), \$1,450,000.

4 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
5 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous ex-
6 penses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
7 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and
8 publications related to public health; and conducting
9 studies and demonstrations in public health methods;
10 \$5,100,000.

11 ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including clothing for patients, and cooperation with organizations or individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$3,000,000.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prepara-
tion of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision
of construction, \$55,000, to remain available until June 30,
1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be
transferred to the General Services Administration.

Construction, treatment and cafeteria building: For
expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and speci-

1 cations for a treatment and cafeteria building at Saint
2 Elizabeths Hospital, \$180,000, to remain available until
3 June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may
4 be transferred to General Services Administration.

5 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

6 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
7 Insurance: For necessary expenses, not more than
8 \$130,000,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age
9 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That such
10 amounts as are required shall be available to pay the cost
11 of necessary travel incident to medical examinations for
12 verifying disabilities of individuals who file applications for
13 disability determinations under title II of the Social Security
14 Act, as amended.

15 Advances to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
16 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, advances to
17 States under section 221 (e) of the Social Security Act, as
18 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
19 year, such sums as may be necessary from the above author-
20 ization may be expended from the Federal old-age and
21 survivors insurance trust fund.

22 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
23 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid
24 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
25 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social

1 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
2 X, and XIV), \$1,600,000,000, of which such amount as
3 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period
4 in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year:
5 *Provided*, That not more than \$104,000,000 of the amount
6 herein appropriated shall be used for expenses of State and
7 local administration: *Provided further*, That none of the
8 amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs
9 of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1,
10 1957.

11 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
12 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
13 \$1,900,000.

14 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
15 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
16 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
17 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
18 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-
19 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
20 \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation
21 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
22 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the
23 care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
24 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
25 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed

1 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
2 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund,
3 so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
4 That any State plan which provides standards for professional
5 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
6 shall be approved.

7 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
8 grants to States for maternal and child-health services,
9 services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
10 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
11 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
12 \$41,500,000, of which \$15,000,000 shall be available for
13 services for crippled children, \$16,500,000 for maternal and
14 child-health services, and \$10,000,000 for child-welfare
15 services: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
16 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
17 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
18 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
19 estimated to be expended by the State: *Provided further*,
20 That \$1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502
21 (b) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for
22 mentally retarded children.

23 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
24 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of
25 Social Security, \$300,000, together with not to exceed

1 \$240,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
2 survivors insurance trust fund.

3 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
4 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
5 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, and section 705
6 of title VII, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as
7 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
8 year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations in-
9 curred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments
10 under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation
11 therefor for that fiscal year.

12 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
13 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
14 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in
15 the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
16 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to
17 a State plan approved under such title prior to or during
18 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect
19 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
20 such plan was submitted for approval.

21 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

22 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-
23 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,800,000,
24 together with not to exceed \$260,000 to be transferred from
25 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration:

For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Administration, \$2,300,000, together with not to exceed \$700,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:

For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel, \$500,000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not to exceed \$425,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Surplus property utilization: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j), (k), (n), and (o), of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, \$502,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for

1 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
2 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
3 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

4 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
5 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses
6 and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with
7 the functions or activities for which such appropriations are
8 made.

9 SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for
10 salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or
11 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
12 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131).

13 SEC. 206. None of the funds appropriated by this title
14 to the Social Security Administration for grants-in-aid of
15 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
16 operation of said agencies, including the salaries and ex-
17 penses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be
18 withheld from the said agencies of any States which have
19 established by legislative enactment and have in operation
20 a merit system and classification and compensation plan
21 covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation
22 of their employees, because of any disapproval of their per-
23 sonnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of
24 the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or
25 employees.

1 SEC. 207. The Secretary is authorized to make such
2 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,
3 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
4 out the operations of the Department.

5 SEC. 208. None of the funds provided herein shall be
6 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a
7 research project an amount for indirect expenses in con-
8 nection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of
9 the direct costs.

10 SEC. 209. None of the obligational authority available
11 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for
12 planning and/or construction of buildings shall remain avail-
13 able after June 30, 1959.

14 SEC. 210. None of the funds provided herein shall be
15 used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or plan-
16 ning of any building for the Department of Health, Educa-
17 tion, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor
18 shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the
19 salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone
20 in connection with the construction or planning of any
21 building for the Department of Health, Education, and
22 Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

23 This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,
24 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958".

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS

BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141–167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131) ; \$9,384,800: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U. S. C. 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (29 U. S. C. 203), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at

1 least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby
2 is used for farming purposes.

3 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
5 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
6 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
7 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$520,000.

8 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
9 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the
10 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and
11 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to
12 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including steno-
13 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the
14 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$250,000.

15 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
18 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
19 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$525,000, of which not
20 less than \$155,000 shall be available for compensation (at
21 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees
22 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
23 as amended.

1 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

2 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
3 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
4 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
5 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board,
6 when specifically authorized by the Board; stenographic
7 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
8 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and uniforms or allow-
9 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,
10 1954 (68 Stat. 1114) ; \$8,150,000, to be derived from the
11 railroad retirement account.

12 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
13 CONCILIATION SERVICE

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
15 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
16 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,
17 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
18 as provided in section 205 of said Act; expenses of boards of
19 inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206
20 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, concil-
21 iators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess
22 of \$75 per diem; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
23 for replacement only at not to exceed \$3,000; expenses of
24 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial

1 relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
2 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,550,000.

3 TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE
4 POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

5 Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac
6 River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to
7 pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac
8 River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses
9 of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the
10 administration of its business in the conservancy district
11 established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat.
12 748), \$5,000.

13 TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

14 For maintenance and operation of the United States Sol-
15 diers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent
16 fund, \$4,750,000, of which \$34,000 shall remain available
17 until June 30, 1959 for construction of buildings and facili-
18 ties, including demolition: *Provided*, That this appropriation
19 shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of
20 members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at
21 rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the
22 Army, upon the recommendation of the Board of Commis-
23 sioners of the Home and the Surgeon General of the Army.

1 TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this
3 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not
4 authorized by the Congress.

5 This Act may be cited as the “Departments of Labor,
6 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act,
7 1958.”

Passed the House of Representatives April 4, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

APRIL 8, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 10, 1957
For actions of June 7, 1957
85th-1st, No. 98

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....6	Electrification.....10	Public Law 480.....5
Agricultural appropriations.....1	Food prices.....11	Reclamation.....20
Air pollution.....12	Foreign aid.....2,8	Safety.....3
Appropriations.....1,5,21	Forestry.....4,5	Statehood.....7,16
Audit.....4	Legislative program.....5	Taxation.....10
Budget.....8,9,19	Monopolies.....14	Transportation.....13
Depressed areas.....18	Personnel.....17	Veterans' benefits.....15

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committees reported: Agriculture, Independent Offices, and Labor-HEW appropriation bills. Mutual security authorization bill.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H.R. 7441, the Agricultural appropriation bill (p. D501). Representatives of the Department agencies have been advised in detail of the Committee's actions on the estimates for the Department. Copies of the bill, committee report, and hearings will be distributed directly to the agency budget offices, as soon as received, pursuant to a distribution list that has been worked out with the Department agencies. The agencies will receive the material at the same time this office will receive it. The material will not be distributed from this office. In general, copies should be obtained from the agency budget offices rather than from this office. At the end of this Digest is a summary of the Committee actions.

The Appropriations Committee ordered reported with amendments the following bills:

~~H.R. 6070, 1958 independent offices appropriation bill, providing a total of \$4,378,224,800, a decrease of \$6,976,900 from the House-passed total of \$5,385,201,700. p. D501~~

H.R. 6287, 1958 Labor Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, providing a total of \$2,885,290,781, an increase of \$38,459,200 over the House-passed total of \$2,846,831,581. p. D501

2. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Relations Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 2130, the proposed Mutual Security Act of 1957. As approved by the Committee the bill would reduce the total authorization requests by a net of \$227.3 million. pp. D501-2
3. SAFETY. S. 931, to provide for reorganization of the safety functions of the Government, was reported without amendment by the Government Operations Committee on June 5 (S. Rept. 408). This bill creates in the Labor Department a Federal Safety Division to direct and coordinate all safety educational programs and related loss-prevention procedures conducted by the various Federal agencies and to carry out the present functions of the Federal Safety Council; requires Federal agencies to include in their budget estimates, for safety activities, amounts at least equal to those recommended by the Labor Department, unless the departments concerned state in writing to the Labor Department and the Budget Bureau their reasons for not doing so; and imposes penalties for falsifying or concealing facts relative to injury or death of persons compensable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

HOUSE

4. FORESTRY. Received from GAO the first report on the audit of the Forest Service for 1955-56; to Government Operations Committee. p. 7638
5. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the following measures will be considered as soon as the civil rights bill is disposed of, possibly this week: Conference report on H.R. 7221, the third supplemental appropriation bill; H.R. 6974, to extend Public Law 480; S. 469, to extend termination date of Federal supervision over Klamath Indians; and H.R. 7168, the Federal construction contract procedures bill. p. 7628
6. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 10. p. 7638

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

7. STATEHOOD. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dawson in favor of Alaskan statehood and commenting on provisions of the bill. pp. A4465-6
8. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Gary inserted an editorial, 'More Proof of Foreign-Aid Waste;' on the House Government Operations Committee report on foreign aid operations. p. A4467
Extension of remarks of Rep. Smith urging the expansion of the technical assistance program on a long-term basis. p. A4467
Rep. Haley inserted a letter from a constituent protesting the size of the budget and continued foreign aid. p. A4471
Rep. Sullivan inserted a letter from a Postal employee contending that foreign aid should be suspended if the Government couldn't afford to give its workers a pay increase. pp. A4480-1 to
Rep. Bosch inserted a column relating/certain foreign aid expenditures and criticizing the program. p. A4481
9. BUDGET. Rep. Coad inserted an editorial, 'Who Is In Charge Down There?', criticizing the administration's stand on the budget. pp. A4469-70
10. TAX AMORTIZATION ; ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Ullman inserted two articles concerning the fast tax writeoff granted the Idaho Power Co. pp. A4470-1

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRI-
ATION BILL, 1958

JUNE 7, 1957.—Ordered to be printed
Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of May 13, 1957

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6287]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill passed by House.....	\$2, 846, 831, 581
Amount added by Senate (net).....	38, 459, 200
Total of bill as reported to Senate.....	2, 885, 290, 781
Amount of appropriations, 1957.....	2, 884, 858, 181
Amount of the regular estimates, 1958.....	2, 981, 927, 581
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Over the appropriations for 1957.....	432, 600
Under the estimates for 1958.....	96, 636, 800

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 775, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 619, 000
House allowance.....	1, 480, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 480, 000

No increase is recommended. The 1957 appropriation on a comparable basis is \$1,246,725. Mandatory increases amount to \$107,130, resulting in an allowance of \$126,145 over the 1957 program with the mandatory increases. From this increase \$50,000 is provided for a nonrecurring rental item leaving \$76,145 increase for program items.

The committee recommends the deletion of the limitation on the amount of funds available for international labor affairs but is providing only \$200,000 for this activity.

The committee has included a proviso to increase the limitation applicable to 1957 for international labor affairs for \$5,000. This action is required as a result of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 which added \$5,000 obligations to this activity for the payment of additional salary to the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs. The Department had requested from the Bureau of the Budget the submission of language to increase the limitation by the amount of funds required to pay the additional salary, but the Budget Bureau failed to submit the necessary language estimate.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 021, 000
Transfer from highway trust fund.....	300, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	2, 263, 000
Transfer from highway trust fund.....	365, 000
House allowance.....	2, 021, 000
Transfer from highway trust fund.....	365, 000
Committee recommendation.....	2, 191, 000
Transfer from highway trust fund.....	None

The committee recommends an increase of \$170,000, the amount necessary to finance the mandatory increases.

The committee recommends the deletion of the proviso to make available \$365,000 by transfer from the highway trust fund for the administrative expenses of the Solicitor in making wage determinations in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

It is the sense of the committee that the legislative history and intent in the enactment of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 did not contemplate the use of the highway trust fund for this purpose. The question was submitted to the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate for an informal opinion and the committee was advised that "such an appropriation from the trust fund is not authorized."

The committee is aware, of course, that funds will be required to finance the administrative expenses of the Department of Labor in making these wage determinations, necessary for the negotiation of contracts in the Interstate System. The current rate of expenditure is such though as to raise serious doubt as to the amount necessary and the Department is directed to submit a supplemental estimate for consideration by the Congress prior to July 1, 1957.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

1957 appropriation.....	\$911, 500
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 167, 000
House allowance.....	985, 000
Committee recommendation.....	985, 000

No increase over the House allowance is recommended. The funds provided are sufficient to pay the cost of the mandatory increases amounting to \$49,700.

The budget presented by the Department sought increases for a migratory labor program, \$41,000; for the youth employment program, \$63,500; for conducting the President's Safety Conference, \$20,000; for extending safety services to industries using fissionable materials, \$20,000. The action of the committee allows nothing for these increases sought for increased program items.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

1957 appropriation.....	\$383, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	542, 000
House allowance.....	542, 000
Committee recommendation.....	542, 000

This allowance provides \$159,000 over the 1957 appropriation, of which \$21,000 is required for mandatory items. The balance is available for reducing backlogs and improving services to veterans.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

1957 appropriation.....	\$3, 399, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	3, 940, 000
House allowance.....	3, 600, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 600, 000

No increase is recommended. This allowance will provide only for the mandatory increases amounting to \$187,400.

No allowance is made for any of the program increases sought in the budget presentation, including that for \$205,700 for an extension of the Bureau's training service. The committee was informed that there was no area of disagreement between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with this proposed extension of the Bureau's training activities. There was, however, a wide divergence of opinion of the necessity for this increased program among State leaders in the vocational education field.

The Congress was advised that the Department's contemplated plans are authorized by the act creating the Department. But there seems to be some area of disagreement in this connection, and it is suggested to the Department that they submit to the Congress legislative proposals to spell out in very definite terms the program and the authority which they need to embark upon this activity.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$5, 558, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	6, 358, 000
House allowance.....	5, 558, 000
Committee recommendation.....	125, 600
Transfer from Unemployment Trust Fund.....	5, 874, 400

The committee recommends an increase of \$442,000, sufficient to finance the mandatory-increase items and to provide for the program for older worker studies previously financed through the office of the Secretary.

The Bureau's budget contemplated program increases to cost \$357,960 and to add 51 additional employees. The principal items sought were for regional-office leadership of State evaluation programs to get more effective State unemployment insurance and employment service programs, \$85,970; to maintain State audits on a current basis and expand surveys of fiscal management and control in State agencies \$55,460; for new labor market analysis, particularly in areas of persistent and substantial unemployment, \$47,375; and to strengthen State control of tax and claims administration, \$40,015. The amount recommended by the committee will finance none of these contemplated increases.

The funds sought for this item are charged—with the exception of \$125,600 relating to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and unemployment compensation for Federal employees' programs—under the terms of the Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954 to the earmarked three-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. These earmarked funds are available only for the administrative expenses of the program and for payment to the States' accounts for use either for the payment of unemployment-insurance benefits or, where specifically appropriated by the State legislature, for the payment of employment-security administrative expenses. The estimated net collections from this tax in 1958 of \$321,000,000 will be disbursed in its entirety either as administrative expenses or as surplus to State accounts regardless of the action taken on this budget estimate or that for grants to States.

Inasmuch as these funds, with the exception of the minor item cited above, are later offset by payment to the Treasury out of earmarked tax collections imposed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, three-tenths of 1 percent, the committee has provided that the funds, except for \$125,600, be derived by transfer from the unemployment trust fund on a basis similar to that currently made for the Railroad Retirement Board and for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance out of their respective trust funds.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

1957 appropriation.....	\$250, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	270, 000, 000
House allowance.....	249, 814, 000
Committee recommendation.....	260, 000, 000

The committee recommends that an additional \$10,000,000 over the current year's appropriation be made available, and that the

contingency fund carried in the bill for the past 8 years and available only to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in the State law or increases in the number of claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans, which increases in administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustment, be provided in the amount of \$10,000,000. The increase recommended will provide \$7,745,000 estimated to be necessary to cover increases in State salaries and the balance, and \$2,255,000 is provided to meet several of the estimated increases in workloads.

As pointed out in the item next above, funds for this item are charged to the unemployment trust fund, and at the end of the year the Treasury is reimbursed for all expenditures from this account, that is the advance from the Treasury to the Department under this head is offset by reimbursement at the close of the fiscal year by payment out of the collections under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Funds in the Federal unemployment account of the Unemployment Trust Fund cannot exceed \$200 million, the excess being immediately distributed to States' accounts.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO VETERANS

1957 appropriation.....	\$70, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	42, 000, 000
House allowance.....	36, 800, 000
Committee recommendation.....	36, 800, 000

No increase is recommended. It is the sense of the committee that the allowance will be entirely adequate. Attention is directed to the experience over the past several years, which indicates that the Department has grossly overestimated its needs for this program. For fiscal year 1955, the budget estimates amount to \$144,000,000; Congress provided \$126,000,000; the expenditures amounted to \$106,916,550. For fiscal year 1956 the budget estimate was \$150,000,000; Congress allowed \$120,000,000; the actual expenditures were only \$70,096,109. For the current fiscal year the revised budget estimate, reduced after the official submission of the budget in January, was \$90,000,000. Congress allowed \$70,000,000. Indications are that expenditures will be \$55,000,000.

Whatever funds are required must be made available by the Congress. But the estimates from the Department have been so unrealistic that their demand for \$42,000,000 for fiscal 1958 for this program does not appear to be justified.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

1957 appropriation.....	\$25, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	32, 000, 000
House allowance.....	25, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	25, 000, 000

No increase is recommended. It is the sense of the committee that the allowance will be entirely sufficient to pay these statutory benefits. There will be available, in addition to this appropriation of \$25,000,000, a carryover balance of some \$3,000,000 from the current year, to make available a total of \$28,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, an allowance of some \$3,000,000 in excess of the current year requirements.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 125, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	2, 683, 000
House allowance.....	2, 236, 200
Committee recommendation.....	2, 500, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$263,800. This will provide funds for the mandatory increases amounting to \$95,000; an additional \$34,900 for contracting an estimated 62,000 more Mexican nationals and the balance for a more intensive program of making wage determinations, investigating and settling complaints and terminating and extending contracts at the site of employment.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 347, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	2, 838, 000
House allowance.....	2, 838, 000
Committee recommendation.....	2, 838, 000

The funds here recommended provide for the proposed further decentralization of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act program to three additional field offices to be located in Boston, New York, and Chicago.

The Bureau was provided with funds during fiscal year 1953 to expand its field office in San Francisco to service Federal employees' claims reported from Federal establishments in the six Southwestern States for the purpose of testing the advantages of operating this program on a decentralized basis. The experience of this office has demonstrated the advantages of a decentralized operation.

EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION FUND

(Annual Indefinite)

Provision is here made for an annual indefinite appropriation of such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year for the payment of statutory benefits to Federal employees injured in the course of employment.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

1957 appropriation.....	\$6, 875, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	7, 768, 000
House allowance.....	7, 124, 000
Committee recommendation.....	7, 225, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$101,000, an amount sufficient to pay the mandatory increases in 1958. The Bureau had sought increases for new programs amounting to \$526,950 and 76 additional employees. The committee recommendation will enable the Bureau to retain its 1957 strength and to operate its activities at the 1957 level.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

1957 appropriation.....	\$403, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	462, 000
House allowance.....	462, 000
Committee recommendation.....	462, 000

This allowance provides \$20,562 for mandatory increases for the continuing staff and \$58,000 for the establishment of a field service consisting of 4 field representatives and 2 supporting clerical staff.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

1957 appropriation.....	\$9, 988, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	10, 888, 000
House allowance.....	10, 600, 000
Committee recommendation.....	10, 600, 000

No increase over the House allowance is recommended. There is included in the 1958 budget for the Division a request for \$781,600 to cover mandatory cost increases, including \$232,000 for regular promotion costs based on long established policy of hiring investigators at GS-7 and promoting them to grade GS-9 at the conclusion of the requisite training period.

The Division will be enabled to effect these promotions and to pay the balance of the mandatory increases by reducing funds sought for compliance and enforcement.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

1957 appropriation.....	\$230, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	328, 000
House allowance.....	328, 000
Committee recommendation.....	328, 000

The committee approves the House allowance for the full amount of the budget estimate.

This appropriation provides Federal funds for the free Braille textbooks and other educational materials needed for the education of the Nation's blind children. This allowance, together with the \$10,000 permanent annual appropriation, will provide a per capita allowance of \$30.93 for each blind student compared to the \$30.04 made available in the current fiscal year.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$6, 779, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	9, 300, 000
House allowance.....	9, 300, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 300, 000

The committee approves the budget estimate for fiscal year 1958 totaling \$9,300,000 for enforcement operations, an increase of \$2,521,000 or 37 percent over the sum appropriated for the current fiscal year. This proposed increase brings the Food and Drug Administration a step closer to achieving the objectives outlined in the Citizens' Advisory Committee recommendations, as well as carrying forth the policy of strengthening enforcement of the food

and drug laws. The estimate contemplates the addition of 162 new employees, 45 in the departmental service and 117 in the field service.

The committee has added authorization for the purchase of not to exceed 89 passenger motor vehicles, of which 51 are for replacement only. Inspectional personnel are required to be in almost constant travel status and the inspector is required to carry as much as 350 pounds of equipment in the automobile, the equipment costing in excess of \$600. It is the sense of the committee that it will be more economical to provide the vehicles than to pay employees for the operation of personally owned cars.

CERTIFICATION, INSPECTION, AND OTHER SERVICES

(Annual indefinite)

Funds for this program are derived from the collection of fees for the certification of certain antibiotics, coal-tar colors and insulin; inspection of seafood packing plants, and the establishment of tolerances for pesticide residues. Regulations require parties who avail themselves of the services to make advance deposits to insure payment for services rendered. Where no services are rendered or are below those contemplated, refunds are made to the depositors.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 801, 400
1958 budget estimate.....	3, 032, 000
House allowance.....	3, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 000, 000

The committee approves the House allowance, a reduction of \$32,000 below the budget estimate. The Department advised the committee that the reduction of \$32,000 provided by the House allowance would all be assessed against the request for additional nursing positions.

The estimate contemplated increases of approximately \$250,000 for mandatory items and approximately \$95,000 for new program items, for a total change of \$344,200 after adjustments in the 1957 appropriation.

A report to the committee on the effect of the House's action indicated that all of the requested increases went for mandatory items, and new program items totaling approximately \$95,000 would be allowed but that the reduction would be absorbed by a decrease in the nursing program. The committee directs that no decrease be effected in the nursing program.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

1957 appropriation.....	\$615, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	730, 000
House allowance.....	730, 000
Committee recommendation.....	730, 000

The committee approves the House allowance of \$730,000, the budget estimate. This estimate contemplates the addition of 13 additional employees for extension of the research program, for strengthening the instructional program, and for increased auxiliary operating costs, including maintenance and operation of new buildings.

CONSTRUCTION

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 547, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 690, 000
House allowance.....	1, 690, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 690, 000

The committee approves the budget estimate for the third stage in the construction program. The program, which has previously received appropriations amounting to \$4,772,000, is brought to \$6,462,000 by the amount here recommended, leaving a total of \$2,340,000 to be appropriated for fiscal year 1959.

This allowance will provide construction funds for a cafeteria and service building, for a men's residence hall, and for certain outside services, roads, walks, and grating.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$3, 300, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	4, 000, 000
House allowance.....	3, 800, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 800, 000

The committee approves the House allowance, \$200,000 less than the budget estimate but an increase of \$500,000 over the current year's appropriation.

It is the sense of the committee that the allowance will be entirely adequate to finance the continued operation of the college on a high level.

PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

1958 budget estimate.....	\$150, 000
House allowance.....	150, 000
Committee recommendation.....	150, 000

This allowance includes \$80,000 for plans on a physical-education building to cost \$4,600,000 and complete plans on a home-economics building to cost \$1,175,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS

1957 appropriation.....	\$100, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	262, 000
House allowance.....	262, 000
Committee recommendation.....	262, 000

This allowance will provide funds to complete the equipping of the dental-school building.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PROMOTION AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1957 appropriation.....	\$31, 442, 081
1958 budget estimate.....	33, 750, 081
House allowance.....	33, 442, 081
Committee recommendation.....	33, 750, 081

The committee recommends an increase of \$308,000 to make available the full amount authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended. These additional funds will provide \$228,000 for vocational education in the fishery trades and industry and distributive

occupations therein and \$80,000 for grants for vocational education in Guam.

Authority was granted in the appropriation act for the current year to permit the redistribution of funds which States and Territories are not prepared to use, among other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned. The budget estimate requested the continuance of this authority, and the committee recommends its inclusion. It is anticipated that this provision will make full use of available funds for the purposes intended.

FURTHER ENDOWMENT OF COLLEGES OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 501, 500
1958 budget estimate.....	2, 501, 500
House allowance.....	2, 501, 500
Committee recommendation.....	2, 501, 500

The committee recommends the budget estimate, the full amount authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Act, under which funds are made available to land-grant colleges and universities in the several States, Hawaii, and Alaska. Each State and Territory receives annually \$20,000 plus a proportionate share of the balance, \$1,501,500, allotted on a population basis.

GRANTS FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 050, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	3, 000, 000
House allowance.....	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	5, 000, 000

The committee approves the House allowance for this item, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the budget estimate.

The Library Services Act provides for the further extension of public library services by the several States to the rural areas without such services or with inadequate service. Library authorities estimate that currently some 27 million people, mostly in the rural areas, in the United States are without access to local public library services, and an additional 53 million have only inadequate service. A total of \$7,500,000 is authorized for this program annually for the next succeeding 4 fiscal years.

The committee recommends the addition of the following proviso:

Provided, That the amount of any State's allotment from this appropriation which such State certifies will remain unpaid to it on June 30, 1959, may be reallocated by the Commissioner among other States applying therefor in proportion to their rural population, and deemed part of such allotments, except that no State's allotment shall be so increased as to exceed the allotment which would be made to it were this appropriation equal to the maximum authorized under such Act.

This provision will permit the redistribution of funds which States and Territories are not prepared to use among other States and Territories applying therefor. It is anticipated that this provision will permit full use of available funds for the purposes intended.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1957 appropriation.....	\$113, 050, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	127, 000, 000
House allowance.....	127, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	127, 000, 000

The committee approves the House allowance for the full budget estimate. Payments to school districts under Public Law 874, as amended, are authorized through fiscal year 1958, and it is estimated that this allowance will permit the payment of full entitlements for the year.

Payments are made to the school districts based on entitlements in accordance with the formula contained in the act. The full amount of the entitlements has been appropriated each year since the authorization was passed, with the exception of the first year, 1951, when 97.98 percent of entitlements were provided for in the appropriation of \$29,080,788, leaving a deficit of \$605,229, against entitlements totaling \$29,686,017; and in fiscal year 1955, when the appropriation of \$75,000,000 provided for payment of 99.64 percent of entitlements, totaling \$75,270,176.

ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

1957 appropriation.....	\$108, 500, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	41, 800, 000
House allowance.....	41, 700, 000
Committee recommendation.....	41, 700, 000

The committee approves the House allowance, a reduction of \$100,000 below the budget estimate, a decrease in the funds provided for transfer to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for certain technical services.

Assistance for school construction under Public Law 815, as amended, is authorized through fiscal year 1958. These funds are provided to assist local school districts to help build schools needed to house increased numbers of children in federally affected areas. Provision is also made and \$4,000,000 is provided for the Federal construction of schools on Federal property where no local agency is able to accept responsibility for providing free public education to pupils residing on such property.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$5, 270, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	7, 500, 000
House allowance.....	7, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	7, 000, 000

The committee approves the House allowance of \$7,000,000, \$500,000 less than the budget estimate. The allowance provides the full amount requested for mandatory increases. This will permit the Office of Education to continue each activity in 1958 at the same level plus the cost of the mandatory increases. And, in addition, this allowance will provide the full budget estimate for research projects, including those providing for the education of the mentally retarded.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

1957 appropriation.....	\$150, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	300, 000
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	200, 000

The committee recommends an allowance of \$200,000 to enable the President's Committee to fulfill its statutory duty of making a final report to the President and to the Congress not later than December 31, 1957. The funds recommended will provide the necessary administrative expenses for this purpose and expenses for liquidation of the program thereafter.

GRANTS FOR STATE COMMITTEES ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

1958 budget estimate.....	\$650, 000
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	None

No funds are provided for this request. The estimate was considered by the Congress in connection with the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957. It is the sense of the committee that following the final report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School due not later than December 31, 1957, Congress should again consider what steps should be taken to effect any of the recommendations.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

GRANTS TO STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$39, 500, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	45, 100, 000
House allowance.....	45, 100, 000
Committee recommendation.....	45, 100, 000

The committee approves the House allowance of \$45,100,000, the full amount of the budget estimate, to provide \$40,000,000 for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2, \$1,500,000 for extension and improvement projects under section 3, and \$3,600,000 for special projects under section 4.

This allowance is, in the view of the committee, sufficient to provide maximum Federal funds which States can match under the provisions of the act.

TRAINING AND TRAINEESHIPS

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 950, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	4, 400, 000
House allowance.....	4, 400, 000
Committee recommendation.....	4, 400, 000

The committee approves the House allowance of \$4,400,000, the full budget estimate, to provide an additional sum of \$778,850 for teaching grants and \$671,150 for traineeships.

There is carried in the 1957 appropriation a requirement that not less than \$200,000 shall be available only for prosthetics education programs. The Department allotted out of the 1957 appropriation a total of \$204,000 for this purpose and included in its budget for the fiscal year 1958 a request for \$210,000 for continued support of the programs now underway in prosthetics education. Since their

estimate calls for the continued support in excess of the 1957 limitation, it is felt that the limitation should be removed.

Section 4 of the act authorizes grants to schools, universities, and other agencies to pay part of the cost of training projects and traineeships. The grantee must, in every instance, assume a part of the program or course for which the Federal grant is made. In fiscal year 1955, the first year of operations, the grantee's share was required, under the terms of the appropriation, to be at least one-third of the total training cost. The one-third matching requirement is no longer applicable, but during 1956, the last year for which accurate data are available, the grantee's share averaged 45 percent of the total training cost.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 160, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 445, 000
House allowance.....	1, 330, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 330, 000

The committee approves the House allowance of \$1,330,000, a reduction of \$115,000 below the budget estimate, but \$170,000 above the 1957 appropriation.

This allowance will provide the requested \$71,360 needed for mandatory increases and \$98,640 and 19 additional employees for a strengthened field service in order to administer the expanding vocational rehabilitation program in the States.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

ASSISTANCE TO STATES, GENERAL

1957 appropriation.....	\$17, 591, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	24, 609, 000
House allowance.....	19, 592, 000
Committee recommendation.....	22, 592, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$3,000,000 to provide the full amount requested, \$15,000,000, for grants for general health activities in the States. The request for special language and \$1,500,000 for new programs of special projects in health of the aged and chronic disease has been disallowed for the reasons enumerated in the House report on the bill.

The additional funds recommended will permit an increase for local health departments in number of physicians, nurses, sanitarians, and other professional personnel providing preventive health services to the people of the community; increased quality and scope of preventive health services at the local level, particularly through the stimulation and support of health services for older persons, services for the prevention and control of chronic diseases, occupational health services and other newer and vitally needed health services; and establish local preventive health services in counties and cities where no organized health programs now exist.

Attention is directed to the fact that, with a population increase of more than 20 million during the past decade, there are no more organized local health departments than there were 10 years ago. This means that 18 million people are living in areas with no full-time, organized community health services, and millions more live in areas where such services are only fragmentary.

The approval of the House allowance for other items in this account will provide the full amount requested for mandatory items, \$175,000 and will provide the additional \$1,000,000 requested for grants for public-health training to make available \$2,000,000 for the coming fiscal year; and for the health of aged and chronic diseased there is provided \$462,900 with 49 additional employees. For accident prevention there is provided \$292,300 and 21 additional employees.

GRANTS AND SPECIAL STUDIES, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 170, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	2, 165, 000
House allowance.....	2, 165, 000
Committee recommendation.....	2, 165, 000

This allowance provides \$1,000,000 to assist the Territory to provide an integrated mental-health program, including outpatient and inpatient care and treatment of the Alaskan mentally ill, as provided in the Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act of 1956.

The act authorizes the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for each of the 2 fiscal years, 1958 and 1959, at which time the appropriation will be reduced to \$800,000, and for a successive reduction of \$200,000 each second year thereafter, until the Territory of Alaska will be required to assume full fiscal responsibility after June 30, 1967.

VENEREAL DISEASES

1957 appropriation.....	\$4, 195, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	4, 415, 000
House allowance.....	4, 415, 000
Committee recommendation.....	4, 415, 000

This allowance will provide \$1,700,000 for grants to States for venereal-disease control, a grant which was increased last year by the Congress from \$1,200,000 to \$1,700,000. Mandatory increases will require approximately \$126,000 leaving approximately \$94,000 with five new employees for expansion of research on syphilis.

Evidence presented to the committee indicated a disappointing rise in incidence of this disease. On the other hand, the committee learned that there is definite progress in more effective techniques of diagnosis and case finding and continuing work on the development of an immunizing agent for syphilis. A rapid diagnostic test performed on whole blood rather than serum and conducted in a few minutes without extensive laboratory facility offers great promise.

TUBERCULOSIS

1957 appropriation.....	\$6, 660, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	7, 000, 000
House allowance.....	7, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	7, 000, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance, the full budget estimate, an increase of \$340,000 over the 1957 appropriation.

The increase recommended will provide \$115,000 for mandatory items, and \$225,000 for expansion of the research program on the effectiveness of isoniazid in prevention of tuberculosis. Preliminary findings are so promising as to encourage a vigorous continuation of this work.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

1957 appropriation.....	\$5, 750, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	6, 260, 000
House allowance.....	6, 200, 000
Committee recommendation.....	6, 250, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$50,000 over the House to allow \$6,250,000, a reduction of \$10,000 below the budget estimate but an increase of \$500,000 over the 1957 appropriation. The committee recommendation will provide \$50,000 to enable the Communicable Disease Center to intensify its program in connection with rabid bats, particularly in the Southwestern States. But the condition also prevails in other parts of the country. Justification for the committee recommendation appears on pages 1021 to 1033 of the hearings.

SANITARY ENGINEERING ACTIVITIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$9, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	13, 063, 000
House allowance.....	12, 640, 000
Committee recommendation.....	12, 640, 000

The committee approves the House allowance representing a reduction of \$423,000 under the budget estimate but an increase of \$3,640,000 over the 1957 appropriation.

This allowance provides the increases for the mandatory items amounting to approximately \$595,000, an additional \$1,192,795 for air pollution, and an additional \$1,828,960 for water supply and water pollution control.

The Department had sought the restoration of \$213,000 for research, training, and technical assistance in the radiological health activity. It is the view of the committee that the enlargement of this program is somewhat premature to educate States on a very primitive basis on a matter and in a field comprehensively covered by the Atomic Energy Committee.

GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS CONSTRUCTION

1957 appropriation.....	\$50, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	50, 000, 000
House allowance.....	50, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	45, 000, 000

The committee recommends a reduction of \$5,000,000 below the House allowance and budget estimate. The committee, in reducing this item \$5,000,000, has included the following language:

** * * which together with the amount appropriated under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 769), shall be applied to payment on account of allotments made for the current and preceding fiscal years pursuant to said Act, such sums to remain available only until June 30, 1959: Provided, That allotments under section 6 for the current fiscal years shall be made on the basis of \$50,000,000.*

While this language appropriates only \$45,000,000, it provides for allotments to States on the basis of \$50,000,000, the total amount authorized. This assures that States wishing to avail themselves of the maximum amount authorized may do so. On the other hand, it takes into account that some jurisdictions will not apply for all of the

funds authorized and it is therefore not necessary to appropriate the full authorization so long as provision is made to allot the funds to States on the basis of the maximum authorization.

It is anticipated that \$2,500,000 of the current year's appropriation of \$50,000,000 will not be used and will revert to the Treasury. If the full authorization of \$50,000,000 were appropriated for fiscal year 1958, it is expected that there would be similar savings of \$2,500,000. The committee provision will, however, make available to each State ready to use their maximum allotments the full amounts which they would receive out of the maximum authorization. The reduction recommended by the committee will not delay the construction of a single project.

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

1957 appropriation.....	\$125, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	121, 200, 000
House allowance.....	121, 200, 000
Committee recommendation.....	121, 200, 000

The committee approves the House allowance, which is a reduction of \$3,800,000 from the 1957 appropriation, a reduction applicable in its entirety to projects under part C, the original Hill-Burton program.

This allowance provides for projects under part C, \$99,000,000, a reduction of \$3,800,000 below the current appropriation; for projects under part G, \$21,000,000, the same amount as appropriated for the current year and as was appropriated for the preceding fiscal years; and \$1,200,000 for research in certain hospital use, as authorized in section 636 of the Public Health Service Act.

SURVEYS AND PLANNING FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Senator Thyne, of Minnesota, a member of this committee, introduced a bill, S. 1969, to continue availability of funds for surveys and planning under title 6 of the Public Health Service Act, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration. The committee recommends the inclusion of the following:

Surveys and planning for hospital construction: The funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 810), shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1959.

This item will effect the purpose of S. 1969 to make available the surveys and planning funds for 2 additional years. There was appropriated by the Congress for surveys and planning for hospital construction, \$2,000,000, which has been available for 3 fiscal years. But as of April 30, 1957, there had been used only \$907,000, leaving an unobligated balance of \$1,093,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 381, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 450, 000
House allowance.....	1, 450, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 450, 000

This allowance will provide an increase to cover only the increased mandatory costs in 1958.

HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

1957 appropriation.....	\$40, 195, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	44, 399, 000
House allowance.....	44, 399, 000
Committee recommendation.....	44, 399, 000

The committee approves the House allowance for the full budget estimate, an increase of \$4,204,000 over the appropriation for the current year. This allowance will provide funds needed for mandatory cost increases for fiscal year 1958 amounting to \$2,150,000 and will provide \$1,000,000 additional for expansion of the nurse training grants program from \$2,000,000 in the current year to \$3,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. Approximately \$1,000,000 is provided for strengthening of the existing hospital program. The committee recommends the inclusion of language as follows:

** * * including \$1,186,000 to be available only for payments for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250-254).*

This recommendation will continue the earmarking of funds requested for this activity as was done with respect to funds provided in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, just passed by the Congress.

FOREIGN QUARANTINE SERVICE

1957 appropriation.....	\$3, 315, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	4, 026, 000
House allowance.....	3, 876, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 876, 000

This allowance provides increases for mandatory items amounting to \$278,000 and, in addition, provides 40 additional employees, 8 of whom will be delegated to work at international airports for the extension of coverage of quarantine inspections and 32 for the control of yellow fever. The reduction of \$150,000 will be offset by the authority provided in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, to provide 24-hour quarantine inspection, with the users assuming the cost of the overtime services.

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$38, 775, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	43, 990, 000
House allowance.....	40, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	42, 500, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$2,500,000 over the House allowance, a reduction of \$1,490,000 under the budget estimate, but an increase of \$3,725,000 over the 1957 appropriation. This allowance provides funds to meet the mandatory items amounting to \$1,786,000 and will provide \$939,000 for new program items, including \$100,000 for the practical nurse school expansion.

The appropriation for 1955, the last year this activity was under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was approximately \$24,000,000. The sum here recommended, \$42,500,000, is an increase of approximately 75 percent provided for the third year for which the Public Health Service has had the exclusive responsibility for the health of the Indians.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$8,762,000
1958 budget estimate.....	5,800,000
House allowance.....	3,096,000
Committee recommendation.....	3,096,000

The committee approves the House allowance, a reduction of \$2,704,000 from the request and a reduction of \$5,666,000 from the 1957 appropriation.

Congress appropriated for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 a total of \$14,297,000 for construction of Indian health facilities. It is estimated that there will be carried forward from these 2 appropriations into fiscal year 1958 a total of \$11,000,508, of which \$9,115,856 was made available for the construction of hospitals and clinics, but for which there will have been obligated through the current fiscal year only \$336,000.

This allowance will make available \$2,596,000 to completely modernize 5 Indian health hospitals in line with minimum Hill-Burton standards and make major improvements in 2 others, and will permit the expenditure of \$500,000 for water supply, sewage, and power facilities which must be corrected if certain hospitals and clinics are to continue in use.

Funds are now, and have been, available for construction of hospitals at Sells, Ariz., and Gallup, N. Mex.; the need is unquestioned and great, and the committee will expect the Department to proceed immediately with resumption of work already authorized by the Congress.

Funds were available for construction before the administration's deferment policy was established in the fall of 1956, more than 15 months after planning money was made available on July 1, 1955, totaling \$450,000 for the 2 projects. But only approximately \$70,000 will have been used by July 1, 1957, 24 months after funds became available.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

On the basis of testimony by governmental and nongovernmental witnesses, and on the basis of informative reports supplied by the National Institutes of Health to the committee throughout the year, the committee is convinced that the past year has been a productive one in medical research. The accomplishments fall into three general classes:

(a) Specific applicable findings have, as indicated in the reports below on the individual Institutes, been forthcoming in virtually all fields.

(b) The training of medical scientists has proceeded at an accelerated pace.

(c) The fundamental work prerequisite to applied findings of the future has proceeded at a satisfactory pace, but further effort in this area is indicated.

To increase and sustain momentum in medical research, two general objectives appear to the committee to be clear and imperative. The first is that training for medical science should be further strengthened. The second is that research on the massive problems generated by the major diseases should not be limited by lack of money.

There follow the committees' observations and directions related to these objectives.

With respect to training, note is taken of expansion of old programs and in the establishment of new programs. These include the general fellowship and traineeship programs, the part-time medical student research fellowship program, the experimental research teaching grant program, the training program for epidemiologists and biometricians, and the senior research fellowship program for the sciences basic to medicine.

The bulk of funds for those programs have come initially from categorical funds. Language will be provided so that such programs can be centered in the Division of General Research and Services to an extent necessary. This should increase both the economy and effectiveness of the programs, permitting as it will the expenditure of limited amounts of categorical funds by a central mechanism.

Training in the categorical institutes, except for clearly delineated shortage areas, should concentrate heavily on the training of research workers rather than on production of clinicians with specialized skills. Medical research in this country should be strengthened particularly in areas where other countries have forged ahead, by programs for support in this country of foreign nations with particular competence.

The committee is convinced, on the basis of inquiries relating to the effects of nuclear radiation on humans, that the scientific base for such activities is inadequate. More attention should be given particularly to developing knowledge in those sciences upon which protection against radiation must depend. The committee also wishes research on germ-free life to go forward.

The major program advances are related to five appropriations and will be discussed below. The increases proposed by the committee emphasize the point of view that the killing and crippling diseases covered by the respective institutes constitute such a drain upon the economy and have such an impact upon our Nation from a humane point of view that research into their prevention, cure, or amelioration should not be limited by lack of money.

The budget of the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 1957 was increased by the Congress to a level of \$183 million, or \$56 million above the budget request of \$127 million. In making this expanded appropriation, the Congress directed the National Institutes of Health to support research of high caliber, but to avoid expenditure of funds on research not meeting the established standards of excellence. A review of progress at this point attests to the foresight of the Congress in providing large additional sums necessary to support research of high caliber, and reveals that the Institutes will have approximately \$12 million as unexpended balances rather than support substandard research.

The committee has deleted the provision of the House bill limiting the allowance for indirect costs on research grants to 15 percent. The committee believes that indirect research costs are as much a part of the total cost of research as are direct costs. This principle does not necessarily endorse the inclusion of all of the cost categories which witnesses have urged as being indirect costs. On this point, the committee expects to have the General Accounting Office conduct an extensive study of the proper categories of cost to be considered as indirect costs of research, and to report to the committee by January 1, 1958. The National Institutes of Health should increase indirect cost payments above the current inadequate level by a conservative amount pending the outcome of the detailed study by the General Accounting Office.

GENERAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

1957 appropriation.....	\$12, 122, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	14, 026, 000
House allowance.....	14, 026, 000
Committee recommendation.....	14, 026, 000

The committee recommends \$14,026,000 under this appropriation, the amount of the House allowance and the budget estimate.

This appropriation item covers two groups of activities. The first group consists of research grants, fellowship, and training activities which provide an essential supplement to the disease-based programs of the seven Institutes. The second group consists of the operation of the direct research activities of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda and elsewhere.

Dealing first with the extramural portion of the appropriation, the committee expresses a continuing conviction that a well-rounded program of medical research and research training must encompass the vitally important areas not adequately covered by the disease oriented Institutes.

The research supported by this appropriation has been productive. It is increasingly clear that rapid progress in the conquest of disease is dependent in large part upon the availability of a large body of basic scientific knowledge from which advances against heart disease, cancer, mental illness, and the other major killers and cripplers of our time can be derived.

Research projects supported by grants from appropriations for general research and services are therefore concentrated in fundamental fields—pathology, pharmacology, biochemistry, and so on, and on diseases and conditions not encompassed by the categorical institutes. These noncategorical studies often yield progress that has evident application in medical and public health practice.

The lives of thousands of infants may be saved by grant-supported finding of a treatment for infants suffering from Rh blood factor incompatibility—erythroblastosis fetalis. Another study established a way to counteract the respiratory depression resulting from morphine given to the mother during labor. The molecular structure of the potent tranquilizer reserpine was established, leading to the possibility of its chemical synthesis. Antidotes for certain poisons and nerve gases that attack an enzyme essential to nerve function have been discovered.

In research related to its regulatory function for biological products, the Division of Biologics Standards has found a new test for potency of polio vaccine, using chicks instead of monkeys, which is now in experimental use and may ultimately replace the monkey test. It has also demonstrated that red blood cells can be stored as long as 18 months and still be satisfactory for transfusions.

Similarly, the fellowship and training funds contribute uniquely and indispensably to a fully developed research training function. This complementary function is so significant that it has been singled out for special mention in the general introductory paragraphs of this report.

Turning to the direct operations of the National Institutes of Health, the committee notes first that these laboratories, and the array of services which support them, are an integral part of the total

medical research structure of the Nation. As such, the central guiding principle of the committee applies to these as well as to other laboratories. The principle is that lack of funds should not impede the advance of medical research.

The committee is aware of the acute shortage of administrative space arising from the rapid development of programs directed by the Congress. The committee understands that staff will be working in buildings designed for dogs and monkeys until the contemplated office building is completed. Provision has been made to insure that funds now available for planning and supervision of construction will be available until June 30, 1958, not only for the office building, but also for the dental research building and the building for the National Library of Medicine.

Finally, the committee directs that the National Institutes of Health markedly strengthen its resources for analytical research on both its internal operations and the grants and training program. The committee has received, following specific directions by the committee, reasonably adequate reports on scientific and general program developments. However, it is not satisfied that the National Institutes of Health has as yet developed an adequate system of reports and analyses. Encompassed in this area of analysis is research into the Nation's total medical research resources, since the programs of the National Institutes of Health now comprise a substantial part of these resources.

The quality of reports submitted by the National Institutes of Health has improved to some degree, and the committee directs that both research progress reports and the more general report on development of National Institutes of Health programs be continued.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT FUND

For a number of years provision has been made in the bill under the item for "General research and services, National Institutes of Health" for the operation of a cafeteria at the Clinical Center for the convenience of visitors and employees at prices to fully pay the costs thereof, and to permit the central financing of certain activities such as laboratory research services, plant engineering, and supply services, and biometric services, the costs for which are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to individual appropriations.

The committee is recommending inclusion of the following language to continue provision for the above-enumerated purposes:

National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of operations are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of estimated costs among the various appropriations involved may be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Director, including not to exceed \$2,500 each fiscal year for entertainment

of visiting scientists when specifically approved by said Director, and for the operation of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates to be determined by said Director to be sufficient to cover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: Provided, That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in the fiscal year in which they are advanced: Provided further, That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appropriations from which such funds are advanced.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

1957 appropriation.....	\$48, 432, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	46, 902, 000
House allowance.....	46, 902, 000
Committee recommendation.....	58, 543, 000

The committee recommends \$58,543,000 for activities under this appropriation, an increase of \$11,641,000 over the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The committee wishes to make available the funds for support of all scientifically worthwhile research in this field. Progress in cancer research, measured in the perspective of the past 5 to 10 years, is satisfactory. Radiation and hormone therapy, as well as surgical techniques, have been consistently and substantially improved as the result of research in dozens of laboratories in this country and abroad. These gains are cumulative. They are not as obvious and clearly measurable as is the construction of a building. Yet as findings are assessed in the perspective of a number of years, the gains are clear. Improved means of treating cancer of the breast save mothers in the childbearing age. Cancer of the cervix is technically a problem which is on the brink of solution. Soon the problems will be the psychological and economic ones of early examination and detection.

Radiation treatment, which can effect cures, has been made more powerful and accurate. For example, a compact billion-volt linear electron accelerator has been developed at Stanford University with the aid of a Federal grant. As another example, a television monitoring system has recently been built into the 2-million volt X-ray apparatus at the National Cancer Institute to keep the powerful beam precisely on its target in the patient. In cancer surgery, techniques are constantly being improved, such as the use of chemicals to kill cancer cells lodged in wound closures.

The possible relationship between viruses and cancer is one of the most intriguing and potentially valuable research leads of recent years. It is far too early to assess the significance of this relationship, but a new lead exists, and it should be actively and adequately pursued.

From testimony in the hearings, the committee has noted many similarities in the philosophies, approaches, and the actual substance of research utilized by scientists seeking curative drugs for cancer and for virus diseases. Both groups wish to discover factors which will slow down growth of unwanted and harmful cells or living particles. The committee suggests that the National Cancer Institute assist the two groups in a joint approach to their problems. Since

much money and effort are devoted to obtaining the numerous chemicals, antibiotic beers and related substances being tested for anti-cancer effects, it is logical and economical to explore the potential value of these same materials against the viruses of influenza, poliomyelitis, and a host of other virus diseases for which currently there is no curative drug.

It is clear to the committee that collaborative work between the staffs of the National Cancer Institute and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases is productive and should be extended. The committee approves such joint work, and will expect to be informed of the progress of such research in the annual report on general development of National Institutes of Health programs.

The committee has consistently supported an expanded program of cancer chemotherapy. In view of the priority accorded to this program, the committee considers that progress in making industrial contracts for cancer chemotherapy work has been unnecessarily slow. The committee directs that the utilization of industrial facilities for this program be expedited, and provides an additional \$7 million specifically for this purpose.

In this connection, the committee is fully aware that it is providing funds for research, the outcome of which is unknown. On the judgment of those who are scientifically most competent the committee is fully willing to risk the investment on the ground that the chance of a big payoff is a reasonable one. Such risks are inherent in research.

MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1957 appropriation-----	\$35, 197, 000
1958 budget estimate-----	35, 217, 000
House allowance-----	35, 217, 000
Committee recommendation-----	39, 421, 000

The committee recommends \$39,421,000 for activities under this appropriation, together with \$4,573,000 in unexpended balances from fiscal year 1957. The total of \$43,994,000 is an increase of \$8,777,000 over the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The results of mental health research over the past few years are encouraging.

Most notably, the widespread use of tranquilizers has resulted in an estimated 7,000 fewer mental patients in the public hospitals, of the Nation in 1 year's time. It is of the utmost importance that the values and limitations of these drugs be established in order that their full potential may be realized, and the Congress has given active encouragement and support to this program. The committee was disappointed in the delays encountered in establishing a full-scale drug evaluation program. This period is now passed, and a productive approach for the future is how the program for evaluating drugs which affect mental states can be moved forward most effectively.

The committee notes that the expanded psychopharmacology program has gotten off to a good start this year. A total of \$2,260,329 has been spent both for the research program carried on by the staff of the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda and for grants and fellowships supporting research projects throughout the country.

These projects include clinical studies of the effectiveness of various tranquilizing drugs as well as basic studies on the mechanisms of

drug action and the development of more effective methods of screening drugs and of evaluating the biological and psychological changes which they induce.

Seventy research projects totaling \$1,140,750 will have been supported this year. A total for 1958 of \$978,035 supporting 53 new and continuing projects has already been approved. In addition, 9 projects totaling \$313,469 have received preliminary review and approval.

It is expected that an additional 35 projects will be supported in 1958 for a total program supported from 1958 research grant funds in excess of \$2,000,000.

Including intramural research, technical assistance, and the cost of the psychopharmacology service center, the outlay for the whole psychopharmacology program will exceed \$3,000,000. The committee recommends funds at this level for this critically important program.

Research in other areas continues to be productive. The Addiction Research Center is continuing its program to determine the addicting qualities of newly developed pain-relieving drugs. Last year, 14 such new drugs were evaluated, 11 of which had some addicting liability. Other work is continuing in the effects on the central nervous system when addicting drugs are withdrawn, and physiological levels at which daily dependence on certain drugs is reached.

A new technique for measuring blood circulation in the brain and spinal cord has been developed, thus leading to further study of the relationship between behavior, emotional states, and the physiology of the brain. This measuring method has particular significance because it may show widely varied distributions of blood in the brain in different situations even though the total amount of blood flowing through the brain may remain the same.

A new test has been developed which is especially useful in differentiating between brain-damaged individuals and those whose behavior is disturbed because of other factors. The test involves a series of simple visual recognition tasks and requires little motor response (depressing a key) in registering performance. Although work in this field has just begun, the test may serve as a clinical instrument for aiding in the diagnosis of about 25 percent of the institutionalized mental defectives about whom very little is known.

In the field of mental health, personnel shortages continue to limit research progress as well as the application of research. Because of this, the committee wishes to comment on the mental health training program at some length.

This is the largest training program conducted by a single unit of the National Institutes of Health. Most of the people trained are supporting personnel—such as nurses and social workers—rather than psychiatrists for research and treatment and research workers in basic sciences related to mental states. Supporting personnel are essential if suitably trained people are to be available, but a more intensive effort should be made toward the ultimate solution of the mental health problems. To this end, more psychiatrists with a broad and sound scientific training, and more biologists, chemists, and related scientists are needed. Some of these needs can be met in association with the other institutes in a general training program; others can be resolved only by direct action by the National Institute of Mental Health itself.

[The committee is sufficiently concerned with training in this area that it is requesting the National Institutes of Health to prepare a definitive document on training in the field of mental health. Such a report should include the basic philosophy of the Institutes as this has emerged over the past 10 years; a survey of what has been accomplished over this period of time, separating where possible service from research; a detailed description of the program in fiscal 1957 and 1958; and a careful appraisal of the training needs as best visualized during the coming 5-year period. The committee is well aware of the role played by the Federal Government as a resource for training purposes, but would like to have available for policy consideration a description of the resources of the country as a whole, and be apprised of how these can best be utilized in an all-out effort to improve an unsatisfactory situation today.

The committee would like to see this report prepared by the National Institutes of Health in a manner which could serve as a basis for committee action. Such a report should include, as far as possible, the findings of other groups who are operating in a fashion parallel to the Institutes. It should be possible, with outside help, to have the preliminary findings available for consideration before next year's appropriation hearings.

The committee considers research on training problems such as these to be an integral and appropriate part of the research mission of the Institutes. Additional funds are provided for this activity in the total appropriation and, to the extent required, can be drawn from either the grant, training, or direct operational accounts.

The committee recognizes the importance and the extent of the training programs of the National Institute of Mental Health and is concerned that the direct responsibility for the administration of these programs continue in highly qualified hands. In order to recruit or retain such persons, the committee is providing language which will permit annual compensation at not to exceed \$17,500 for the Chief and Assistant Chief of the National Institute of Mental Health training programs, notwithstanding other provisions of the Civil Service Act, as amended.

NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

1957 appropriation.....	\$33, 396, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	33, 436, 000
House allowance.....	33, 436, 000
Committee recommendation.....	38, 784, 000

The committee recommends \$38,784,000 for activities under this appropriation, an increase of \$5,348,000 over the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The steady increase in congressional appropriations for research in heart disease has been followed by a growing stream of productive research findings. As is true in cancer and other fields, these advances are difficult to cite as discoveries made in any one year. New drugs and new surgical techniques, for example, are typically developed over a period of years rather than discovered at one time in their ultimately usable form.

In this perspective of time, advances are impressive.

Developments in heart surgery—new and improved methods of diagnosis, new operative techniques, use of the artificial heart, grafting of blood vessels, and others—have been spectacular. In congenital heart disease, for example, surgical operations are now restoring to normal or near-normal life many children who would have formerly been marked for invalidism or early death.

Rheumatic heart disease is also being helped by surgery on valves scarred and damaged by rheumatic fever. An even more important achievement, however, has been the development of a means for preventing rheumatic fever itself in its first or in recurrent attacks. The knowledge that prompt and adequate treatment of streptococcal infections with antibiotics can forestall most initial attacks, and that prophylactic treatment can prevent recurrences, could eventually make rheumatic heart disease a rare condition.

Research in the field of hypertension has resulted in greatly improved treatment and management of patients with high blood pressure, particularly through drug therapy. While the ideal drug has not been found, a number of drugs have been developed which lower blood pressure effectively. The use of these agents, singly or in combination, is constantly being improved.

Research in arteriosclerosis has produced much new information which promises to be important in understanding the nature of hardening of the arteries. Studies relating to diet, fat metabolism, hormones, heredity, and other possible factors, searching out clues and leads, are making step-by-step progress toward solving the enigma of this disease.

Despite the extension of heart research during the past year as the result of an increased congressional appropriation, the committee is not convinced that all avenues of productive effort are being explored. In the past, testimony has emphasized the opportunities for advancement in the fields of geographic pathology and comparative anatomy and physiology. The committee is also impressed by testimony pointing out unexploited opportunities to discover and evaluate natural products, both animal and plant, useful in understanding and controlling hypertension. Studies started during the past year in hypertension should result in a better use of drugs already available. Witnesses noted, however, that such investigations do not bear directly on the ultimate understanding of this condition. The committee also agrees with witnesses who question whether the studies on the metabolic and hormone basis of arteriosclerosis are being exploited to the fullest extent. Funds are recommended for studies in such areas, as well as those being more thoroughly explored.

The committee realizes that, despite the training programs which have been supported in recent years, there continues to be a limitation imposed on research progress by personnel shortages, particularly of nonclinical scientists. The Heart Institute should join with other institutes in a comparable position and expand these training programs, which will produce well-trained investigators in the scientific areas which are basic to all categorical areas of disease. Funds are recommended to satisfy such a need.

DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$6, 026, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	6, 430, 000
House allowance.....	6, 430, 000
Committee recommendation.....	6, 430, 000

The committee recommends \$6,430,000 for activities under this appropriation, the amount of the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The committee notes that the reorientation of dental research urged by the committee 2 years ago was largely accomplished within 1 year, and that this change of approach enabled the Institute to approximately double its activities over the past year. This reorientation has been, in concept, the addition of a broad array of scientific skills to dental research and consideration of dental research in the context of the functioning of the entire body.

As an example of this broader approach, the role of protein as a factor in dental health is being established both quantitatively and qualitatively. Components of protein are found to be affected by heat treatment such as occurs in certain commercially prepared foods. The feeding of such diets has been shown to be related to significantly increased incidence of dental caries. Data assembled recently suggests that at least one important factor is related to the inactivation or the loss of lysine, an amino acid, resulting from such heat treatment.

As another example of the broader approach, recent research has made clear the fact that dental disorders that are inherited appear to be associated with other hereditary defects. These facts are being brought out in a large genetic study by the National Institute of Dental Research which is providing not only a wealth of dental information but also a stimulating source of material on many puzzling problems of medical interest in the field of heredity, such as schizophrenia and albinism. The availability of a large group of people who have genetically developed disease is providing information for all Institutes.

ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASE ACTIVITIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$15, 885, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	17, 885, 000
House allowance.....	17, 885, 000
Committee recommendation.....	23, 548, 000

The committee recommends a total of \$23,548,000 for the activities of this Institute, or an increase of \$5,663,000 above the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The committee concurs with the judgment of witnesses that the best hope of reaching the ultimate goals of prevention and cure lies in fundamental research in metabolism, endocrinology, and biochemistry. These areas of study are what may be called special-purpose basic research and funds for extension of research in these fields is provided.

Research of a more directly applicable character progressed satisfactorily during the past year.

The committee notes that steroids that are more effective while producing fewer untoward side effects continue to be developed for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and related metabolic disorders. The evaluation of oral drugs for diabetes has progressed rapidly, and further useful information on the mechanism of action of insulin has been developed. This work should be expanded.

The Institute should play an important role in stimulating research in such neglected areas as ulcerative colitis, hepatitis, and peptic ulcers. These have been neglected areas of study, and further work should be immediately undertaken.

Research on means of detecting intestinal bleeding has proved most fruitful. Studies of the full range of the effects of burn injury, arising from the discovery that administration of salt and soda in water may be an adequate substitute for plasma, have led to productive research in treatment of infections that often complicate burn cases. Gamma globulin effectively controls the burn infections. Such immediately applicable work should progress with the more fundamental studies.

With respect to the general evolution of this Institute, the committee has been particularly impressed by testimony indicating that if the principles and methods of physics can be merged with those of biology, research vistas of the utmost significance will be opened. This merging process has begun and witnesses testified to the effect that the course of medical research over at least the next decade will be fundamentally affected by the developing field of biophysics, much as the last 10 to 20 years has been dominated by the merging of chemistry and biology in the field of biochemistry. Other aspects of this field include such physical phenomena as the effects of high frequency sound, the passage of dissolved gases and solids through membranes, and the electrical properties of molecules important in biology. Perhaps the most widely recognized aspect of the field of biophysics is the effect of radiation on human beings, and particularly atomic radiation. It has by now become plainly evident that there does not exist a full understanding of the precise means by which atomic radiation affects the human organism.

In view of the emerging significance of this relatively new area of physical biology, containing, but not limited to, the effects of radiation, the committee expects this Institute to take the lead in developing research in this field, both in its own laboratories and through grant support. Funds are provided for adequate extension of work in this field.

ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASE ACTIVITIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$13,299,000
1958 budget estimate.....	17,400,000
House allowance.....	17,400,000
Committee recommendation.....	17,400,000

The committee recommends \$17,400,000 for activities under this appropriation, the amount of the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The substantial increases in support for research in the field covered by this Institute have reinvigorated most areas of research.

A new method has been developed and is being used by scientists at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases for de-

tecting hidden viruses ordinarily dormant in the body but which may be capable of causing some forms of heart disease, and which are worth considering as contributing causes of cancer, or mental illness through cumulative damage by undetected attacks on vital or non-vital organs. One of these, the salivary gland virus, formerly thought primarily an infection of infancy, has now been found in persons of all ages.

Another virus, one of the Cocksackie group which causes much illness often confused with nonparalytic poliomyelitis, has for the first time been crystallized from animal tissue, opening the way to study of its chemical makeup. Some strains of Cocksackie virus also have been "trained" to destroy human cancers growing in laboratory animals leading to the possibility that such trained viruses may in the future be adapted to treatment of human cancer. The committee has noted the advisability of more extensive collaboration with the Cancer Institute, and the feasibility of transferring funds for joint work.

Adenoviruses, responsible for many feverish, grippelike upper respiratory infections, have been made into a vaccine which in large-scale trials gave 50 to 70 percent protection to Navy recruits. For the future, there is hope that a similar vaccine can be made for protecting babies and children against many upper respiratory infections.

Better vaccines for many diseases, including possibly tuberculosis, may result from chemical and physical methods that split off from microorganisms the fraction responsible for immunizing power.

A method of blood fractionation, called plasmaphoresis, may increase the Nation's stockpile of blood by making it possible for a person to donate blood five times as often as heretofore considered safe.

The committee has been interested in the field of research on germ-free life, in particular the manner in which this research tool logically joins the areas of interest of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. It appears, for example, that the state of shock may be brought about by a chain of events ending with release of bacterial poisons in the intestines. It should be possible to test this theory by placing germ-free animals under conditions which would ordinarily produce shock. The committee is of the opinion that more extensive collaborative work between the Institutes would be productive.

The committee emphasizes the importance of the need for new knowledge in tropical medicine. While tropical diseases research is conventionally thought of only in terms of our military commitments abroad, the committee emphasizes that our civil populations have at least an equal stake in the results of such activities. In this connection, the committee specifically has in mind the discussions with the National Institutes of Health staff of one proposed activity in Panama. Such an extension of direct research activity is logical. At this time, however, the committee believes that other activities of the Institute should be reoriented to provide an opportunity for the proposed new program. This activity would not minimize the need for continued support on a long-term basis of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. This distinguished group of scientists deserve nothing less. Further, the committee is hopeful that activities conducted under the statutory limitation on the Gorgas appropriation can be effectively expanded through the addition of funds through the research grant mechanism.

NEUROLOGY AND BLINDNESS ACTIVITIES

1957.....	\$18, 650, 000
1958.....	18, 887, 000
House allowance.....	18, 887, 000
Committee recommendation.....	24, 058, 000

The committee recommends \$24,058,000 for activities under this appropriation, an increase of \$5,171,000 over the House allowance and the budget estimate.

The committee continues to be impressed by the vigor of the attack of this Institute upon the obscure and sometimes baffling diseases to which its efforts are dedicated. The fact that the expenditure of substantial means over a period of years has not shed light upon the cause and cure of many neurological disorders is no reflection whatever upon the vitality and scientific productivity of the research program. In this field, as in others, such as cancer, the key to ultimate victory is sustained support over the long periods required to build the base of knowledge prerequisite to the development of applied findings.

Meanwhile, findings of immediate significance are being produced. The stimulating and productive research on cure of focal epilepsy, and on the accompanying work involving detection of the precise function of each area of the brain, continues to proceed in a satisfactory manner. This clinical work, combined as it is with closely coordinated work on the biochemistry of the brain, represents to the committee precisely the type of combined approach which it had in mind when it appropriated funds for the Clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health.

Investigations in other areas are going forward. For example, a diagnostic method has been developed for the early detection and treatment of a virulent form of uveitis, a blinding disease. As another example, a new technique has been developed for detecting the precise location of most brain tumors without opening the skull. Such findings are the product of a vigorous research effort.

As the committee noted in its report on this Institute for fiscal year 1957, "balance must be sustained between large-scale collaborative studies and the efforts of individuals or small groups working independently in the laboratory." Experience over the past year has emphasized the pertinence of this warning. The course of development of the cancer chemotherapy program, as a large-scale collaborative study, has shown clearly that there are definite limits to the rate at which such programs can be expended.

The potential significance of occurrences to mothers during pregnancy, birth, and shortly thereafter—the so-called perinatal period—has been recounted to the committee. There is solid ground for believing that many more neurological disorders than is now known to be the case arise from perinatal influences. For this reason, the time is ripe for a full-scale effort to determine the extent to which adverse conditions during this period are responsible for neurological disorders.

The committee is in full accord with this large-scale research program on the health effects of perinatal influences to be undertaken by this Institute. The committee hopes to see this program expanded with the additional funds made available.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES

1957 appropriation.....	\$30, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	30, 000, 000
House allowance.....	30, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	30, 000, 000

The committee approves the full authorization of \$30,000,000 for the second year of this 3-year program to expire with fiscal year 1959 under the present law.

There will be applications from eligible applicants far in excess of the authorized annual appropriation of \$30,000,000. The committee has been informed that the Advisory Council at its May meeting approved applications for \$27,000,000, or 90 percent of the pending appropriation request.

RETIRED PAY OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 450, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 570, 000
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	Indefinite

The committee has inserted this item, against which a point of order was made and sustained in the House. The payment of these benefits to retired commissioned officers is established by law, and it is incumbent upon the Congress to provide whatever sums are necessary. No administrative control can be exercised over the amount of benefits paid and, since the item is relatively small, the committee has changed this from an annual definite appropriation to an annual indefinite appropriation of "such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year."

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 314, 767
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 450, 000
House allowance.....	1, 450, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 450, 000

The budget estimate is approved to provide for the operating expenses of the National Library of Medicine in the Public Health Service, having been transferred thereto from the Department of Defense in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 941 approved in the last session of Congress.

The National Library of Medicine Act abolished the organization known as the Armed Forces Medical Library and established in its stead the National Library of Medicine in the Public Health Service. This allowance will provide approximately \$62,000 for mandatory items and \$63,000 for new program items including 3 additional employees for the night opening of the library to meet the demands and needs of its users.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$3, 892, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	5, 150, 000
House allowance.....	5, 100, 000
Committee recommendation.....	5, 100, 000

The committee approves the House allowance, a reduction of \$50,000 from the budget estimate but an increase of \$1,208,000 over the 1957 appropriation.

This allowance will provide \$233,300 for mandatory increases and \$953,700 for new program items including an additional 63 employees. The major item included in the new program items is the national health survey program for which 16 additional employees are provided and \$495,673.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$2, 870, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	3, 265, 000
House allowance.....	3, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 085, 800

This allowance, an increase of \$85,800 over the House, will provide an increase of \$348,800 over the 1957 appropriation but a reduction of \$179,200 under the budget estimate.

This allowance will provide \$15,600 for mandatory increases and \$70,200 for other essential items and will permit the hospital to continue the present standards of care and treatment to patients.

The disallowance of the restoration sought, \$85,800, would result in a decrease in reimbursements of \$349,800 for a total reduction in obligational authority of \$435,600—reimbursements constitute approximately 80 percent of the total budget and a reduction in the Federal contribution is accompanied by a proportionate reduction in reimbursements.

MAJOR REPAIRS AND PRESERVATION OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

1957 appropriation.....	\$270, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	55, 000
House allowance.....	55, 000
Committee recommendation.....	55, 000

This allowance will provide the full budget estimate including the preliminary plans for remodeling an extension of the administration building, \$5,600; the replacement of a freight elevator in the general kitchen, \$15,000; additional for electrical facilities for the kitchen of the continued treatment building, \$15,000; and the rewiring and extension of electric facilities in patient buildings, \$19,400.

CONSTRUCTION, TREATMENT AND CAFETERIA BUILDING

1958 budget estimate.....	\$180, 000
House allowance.....	180, 000
Committee recommendation.....	180, 000

This allowance will provide \$186,000 for the preparation of plans and specifications for a 250-bed treatment and cafeteria building to replace an antiquated treatment building constructed in 1871. Total cost of the new facilities is estimated to be \$4,175,000.

A proportionate share of this cost will be borne by the District of Columbia pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 472, 83d Congress. The District of Columbia's share, estimated at \$3,072,000, will be collected over a period of not to exceed 40 years.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$121, 500, 000
1957 budget estimate.....	131, 000, 000
House allowance.....	130, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	130, 000, 000

This allowance will provide \$8,192,155 to meet mandatory increases in fiscal year 1958 and an additional \$3,395,592 for additional program items.

Since July 1956, the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance area office in Birmingham, Ala., has been writing checks for beneficiaries under its insurance program through a delegation from the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department. The committee understands that considerable savings have been accomplished in the Birmingham office through the integration of the OASI accounting and recordkeeping functions with the disbursing functions. In view of the economies which have been effected, the committee feels that the Birmingham delegation should be extended to the other five area offices of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

A group made up of representatives of the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department is currently studying, as directed by the House Committee on Appropriations, the further delegation of checkwriting to several agencies. Unless the findings of this group conclusively demonstrate that the checkwriting function should be retained in the Treasury Department, this committee feels that a delegation to at least the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance should be accomplished at the earliest possible date. The group studying this matter is scheduled to complete its work and make a report not later than June 30, 1957. This committee will expect to be advised of the conclusions which are reached in this connection.

CONSTRUCTION

Committee recommendation.....	\$5, 710, 000
-------------------------------	---------------

The committee recommends an additional transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of \$5,710,000 to make available a total of \$31,080,000 for the construction of an office building on the outskirts of Baltimore for this Bureau. The committee has also included an escalator clause to permit the execution of the building contract at a price higher or lower than the available funds, con-

tingent upon the percentage increase or decrease in construction costs generally dating from October 1, 1956, the date of the computation of this estimate, as determined by the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

Funds for plans and specifications, \$1,500,000, were made available by the Congress on July 1, 1953. The Bureau hopes—some 4 years later—to have the plans and specifications completed early in fiscal year 1958. This protracted delay in getting plans and specifications is attributable to all concerned in the Department, and to an opinion rendered by the General Accounting Office with regard to the limit of cost for the building—no limit of cost was included in the appropriation item at the time but the reports from both Committees on Appropriations had agreed on a specific figure of \$25,370,000, notwithstanding which the Comptroller General ruled that the appropriation amount, several million dollars under the limit of cost as agreed upon in the committee reports, was the controlling one.

The committee has included in this item a proviso that the escalator clause contained therein shall be effective only if the contract for construction is executed on or before December 1, 1957. It will be necessary for the Department to proceed forthwith to get completed plans and specifications and to see that bids are invited and received and a contract executed before the date mentioned.

The committee is certain that there is no justification for an additional day's delay in proceeding with the construction of this most urgently needed building. Since the trust fund is the depository of contributions of workers and employers, there is a special responsibility on the part of all concerned to exercise every precaution in the conservation of these funds. A continuation of the present rental arrangements results in an additional charge against the fund of approximately \$1,750,000 a year.

The committee is concerned that the Bureau has not engaged the services of an individual competent in the construction field to expedite the work on this building in view of the obvious extreme urgency of early occupancy and the continued unnecessary drain on the trust fund. The committee will expect the Bureau to immediately employ such an individual.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 575, 000, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	1, 679, 400, 000
House allowance.....	1, 600, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 600, 000, 000

The committee approves the House allowance, a reduction of \$79,400,000 from the budget estimate, but \$25,000,000 over the 1957 appropriation.

The committee again recommends the striking out of the limitation on the amount of funds to be made available for expenses of State and local administration, in conformance with the position of the Senate in its action on the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Bill, 1957, H. R.

4249, and on the subsequent continuing resolutions, House Joint Resolution 310 and House Joint Resolution 312, with respect to which this committee recommended, and the Senate without dissent approved, that the funds appropriated be made available without limitation.

The committee feels constrained again to suggest that the proponents of a limitation covering the funds to be used for the administrative expenses of the public assistance programs pursue the matter through the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Ways and Means, in whose province falls the amendment of the Social Security Act. Inquiry reveals that there is no pending bill before either committee to effect this purpose, nor has there been such a bill for years.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR TRAINING PUBLIC WELFARE PERSONNEL

1958 budget estimate.....	\$2, 500, 000
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	None

The committee considered the appeal by the Department for restoration of this item, deleted in its entirety by the House, but concluded that no funds should be allowed.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$1, 748, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	2, 216, 000
House allowance.....	1, 900, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 900, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance, a reduction of \$216,000 below the budget estimate, and an increase of \$252,000 over the appropriation for 1957. This increase will provide approximately \$130,000 for mandatory items, and \$22,000 for minor program activities.

In approving the full amount of the budget estimate for 1957, which was a sizable increase over the amount allowed for the fiscal year 1956, the committee expressed the hope that the Bureau would be able to assist the States in achieving more efficient administration, and permit a more frequent review of State and local operations. Testimony of Bureau officials failed to indicate any increase in the frequency of the review, and any increased efficiency of State and local operations has failed to produce economies which can be observed by the committee. With the increase granted in 1957 continued in 1958, the committee will expect to be advised of any concrete evidence of economy resulting from measures instituted as a result of the program expansion authorized.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation-----	\$1, 822, 000
1958 budget estimate-----	2, 154, 000
House allowance-----	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 000, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance of \$2,000,000, \$154,000 below the budget estimate, and \$178,000 above the appropriation for 1957.

The funds recommended will provide for approximately \$102,000 in mandatory items, and \$76,000 for program expansion.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

1957 appropriation-----	\$39, 361, 000
1958 budget estimate-----	41, 500, 000
House allowance-----	41, 500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	41, 500, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance, the full amount of the budget estimate.

The funds recommended will provide the full amount authorized for maternal and child health services, \$16.5 million; \$15 million for crippled childrens services; and within \$2 million of the amount authorized for child welfare services.

The specific allowance of \$1 million for special project grants for mentally retarded children, initiated by the committee in 1957, is continued in the bill.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH OR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN SOCIAL SECURITY

1958 budget estimate-----	\$2, 080, 000
House allowance-----	None
Committee recommendation-----	None

No funds are allowed for this new activity. The committee considered the Department's appeal for restoration of the budget estimate, disallowed by the House, but concluded that no allowance should be made.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation-----	\$212, 000
OASI transfer-----	160, 000
1958 budget estimate-----	315, 000
OASI transfer-----	244, 000
House allowance-----	300, 000
OASI transfer-----	240, 000
Committee recommendation-----	300, 000
OASI transfer-----	240, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance, a reduction of \$19,000 from the budget estimate, but represents an increase of \$168,000 over the 1957 appropriation. Numerous amendments to

the Social Security Act within the past few years have added considerably to the workload of this office, while there has been only a minor increase in staff. The funds here recommended will permit the Commissioner to add 18 positios to his staff.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation-----	\$1, 588, 000.
OASI transfer-----	225, 000
1958 budget estimate-----	2, 015, 000
OASI transfer-----	282, 000
House allowance-----	1, 800, 000
OASI transfer-----	260, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 800, 000.
OASI transfer-----	260, 000.

The committee recommends the amount of the House allowance, a total of \$2,060,000, a reduction of \$237,000 below the budget estimate, and an increase of \$247,000 over the 1957 appropriation. The increase over the current year will provide approximately \$134,000 for mandatory increases, and \$113,000 for program increases.

The committee notes that even with the substantial increase granted in 1957 over the 1956 allowance, positions were added to the staff of the Office of the Secretary which were neither authorized nor submitted to the Congress for consideration. The committee will expect the Department in the future to justify such additions before taking such action.

In commenting on the effect of the House action, the Department remarked that preparation for continuation of essential activities at the seat of government and elsewhere during civil-defense emergencies will have to be performed by employees already on the roll. The committee concurs in this arrangement and urges its adoption throughout the Department. The funds recommended for the Department in this bill, however, do not provide for any of the functions of the Federal Civil Defense Administration delegate agency programs, for which no estimates were considered by this committee in connection with this bill.

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation-----	\$1, 985, 000.
OASI transfer-----	568, 000
1958 budget estimate-----	2, 355, 000.
OASI transfer-----	708, 000.
House allowance-----	2, 300, 000.
OASI transfer-----	700, 000.
Committee recommendation-----	2, 300, 000.
OASI transfer-----	700, 000

No increase is recommended. The committee concurs in the House action in allowing the requested increase over the 1957 appropriation for grant-in-aid auditors, and for central voucher auditing, and payrolling in the regional offices.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$426, 000
Transfers.....	419, 100
1958 budget estimate.....	559, 000
Transfers.....	477, 000
House allowance.....	500, 000
Transfers.....	450, 000
Committee recommendation.....	500, 000
Transfers.....	474, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$24,000 in the transfer from the OASI trust fund.

Amendments to the Social Security Act during both the 83d and 84th Congresses, particularly with reference to the old-age and survivors insurance program, substantially increased the workload of this office. The increase recommended will provide for the 3 positions requested for the OASI division, as well as 1 position in the welfare and education division.

SURPLUS PROPERTY UTILIZATION

1957 appropriation.....	\$450, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	502, 000
House allowance.....	502, 000
Committee recommendation.....	502, 000

No increase is recommended. The House allowed the full amount of the budget estimate, which will provide \$26,850 for mandatory items, and \$25,150 for 4 positions for the Boston and Denver regional offices.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

INDIRECT COSTS OF RESEARCH

The bill as it passed the House contained the following section:

SEC. 208. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of the direct costs.

The committee heard a number of eminent witnesses representing universities and research institutions regarding the adverse effects of this limitation on the fiscal structure of such universities and research institutions conducting medical research with funds granted by the Department. Testimony before the committee indicated that schools and other institutions often are forced to absorb costs somewhat in excess of the proposed 15 percent, and that these costs are increasing.

It is the sense of the committee that indirect costs are as much a part of the total cost of research as are direct costs. There is not sufficient evidence available, however, to establish a fixed percentage at this time. For this reason, the committee will request the General Accounting Office to conduct a study of this matter and render a

report by January 1, 1958. Pending the outcome of the study, the committee is of the opinion that indirect cost payments should be increased by a conservative amount above the current level.

LIMITATION OF AVAILABILITY OF CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

The Congress last year in its consideration of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, approved funds for the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a general office building and a dental research building for the National Institutes of Health, and for the construction of library facilities for the National Library of Medicine.

In recommending these funds this committee was under the belief that the provisions of law (31 U. S. C. 682), continued available such funds until the final completion of the buildings. However, on May 28, 1957, the Comptroller General ruled that funds made available for the preparation of plans and specifications were available only during the year for which appropriated. The committee accordingly recommends the inclusion of the following proviso at the conclusion of section 209:

Provided, That existing obligational authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of the general office and the dental research buildings of the National Institutes of Health, and the National Library of Medicine building of the Public Health Service, shall remain available until June 30, 1958.

There was unobligated on April 30, 1957, \$134,505 of the \$300,000 made available for the general office building; \$349,976 of the \$350,000 for the library facilities; and the full amount of the \$200,000 for the dental research building.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRAVEL EXPENSES

The committee recommends the inclusion of the following section:

SEC. 211. To the extent and under the conditions provided by regulations of the Secretary, officers (including commissioner officers of the Public Health Service) and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may hereafter, in connection with their attendance at meetings or in performing advisory services concerned with the functions or activities of the Department, be permitted to accept payment, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal agencies, organizations, and individuals, for travel and subsistence expenses, to be retained by them to cover the cost thereof or deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost thereof is paid, as may be provided in such regulations.

This authority would be used by the Department in meeting the requests of groups concerned with the work of the Department for special advisory services, and for attendance at meetings when so requested by non-Federal agencies, organizations, or individuals.

Similar authority has been contained in the appropriation acts for the Department for a number of years in connection with the Office of Education.

The Department has indicated a need for such authority not only in connection with the Office of Education, but also in connection with scientific and other work of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

1957 appropriation.....	\$8, 951, 500
1958 budget estimate.....	9, 575, 000
House allowance.....	9, 384, 800
Committee recommendation.....	9, 384, 800

No increase is recommended. The amount allowed, an increase of \$433,800 over the 1957 appropriation, will permit the Board to make the mandatory contribution to the retirement fund of \$427,900 but will require the absorption of other mandatory items approximating \$95,000.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$475, 500
1958 budget estimate.....	520, 000
House allowance.....	520, 000
Committee recommendation.....	520, 000

No increase is recommended. The amount allowed is \$44,500 over the 1957 appropriation, which provides for mandatory items totaling \$27,000, and an increase in staff of 1 mediator, plus related expenses.

ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

1957 appropriation.....	\$250, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	250, 000
House allowance.....	250, 000
Committee recommendation.....	250, 000

No increase is recommended. The amount recommended covers the salaries and expenses of members of Presidential boards, arbitration boards, and neutrals appointed on special boards of adjustment in the railroad industry.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

1957 appropriation.....	\$486, 500
1958 budget estimate.....	525, 000
House allowance.....	525, 000
Committee recommendation.....	525, 000

No increase is recommended. The recommended allowance will provide for the administrative expenses connected with the Board's work, no appropriation being required for the salaries of the 36-member Board, half of which are paid by the carriers and half by labor organizations.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$7, 600, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	8, 150, 000
House allowance.....	8, 150, 000
Committee recommendation.....	8, 150, 000

No increase is recommended. The amount recommended is for the full amount of the budget estimate, which is an increase of \$550,000 over the amount available during the current year. These funds are made available from the railroad retirement trust fund, and are for the administrative costs of operating the railroad retirement program.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1957 appropriation.....	\$3, 295, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	3, 610, 000
House allowance.....	3, 550, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 550, 000

The committee approves the House allowance of \$3,550,000, which is \$60,000 less than the budget estimate, and \$255,000 above the 1957 appropriation to provide for mandatory increases.

The committee has also included language to permit the payment of costs for Government-listed telephones in private residences or apartments for the official use of mediators who are located in cities where no Federal mediation service office is maintained. No additional funds were requested for this authority, as officials of the service testified that the additional costs would be absorbed out of the funds provided. The committee was advised that the Comptroller General has ruled that specific authority must be obtained in the appropriation act concerned before such an expenditure may be made.

The arrangements under which these telephones will be installed require that the employee have his own private phone to insure that the Government is not providing personal phone service.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER
BASIN

1957 appropriation.....	\$5, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	5, 000
House allowance.....	5, 000
Committee recommendation.....	5, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance of the full budget estimate of \$5,000, which is a contribution to the Commission toward administrative expenses. The Commission is a joint agency representing the States in the Potomac River Basin, organized to encourage cooperative effort among the States on pollution problems in the basin.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

1957 appropriation.....	\$6, 643, 000
1958 budget estimate.....	4, 750, 000
House allowance.....	4, 750, 000
Committee recommendation.....	4, 750, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance of \$4,750,000, the full amount of the budget estimate, which is \$1,893,000 below the 1957 appropriation. The reduction below 1957 does not affect operation of the home, as funds were provided in that year for the construction of a service center.

These funds, derived from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund, which consists of contributions from Regular members of the Army and Air Force, court-martial pay stoppages or fines, and all forfeitures on account of desertion, are for the maintenance and operation of the home.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Increase(+), decrease (-)
Office of Education:			
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907) -----	\$2, 550, 000	\$2, 550, 000	-----
Payments to States for promotion of vocational education (act of Feb. 23, 1917) -----	7, 138, 331	7, 138, 331	-----
Total -----	9, 688, 331	9, 688, 331	-----

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1957	Estimates, 1958	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees Compensation:			
Relief and rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.....	\$35,000	\$35,000	
Relief and rehabilitation, Workmen's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia.....	5,000	5,000	
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work.....	46,879		-\$46,879
Total, Department of Labor.....	86,879	40,000	-46,879
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Patients' benefit fund, Public Health Service hospitals.....	20,000	20,000	
Public Health Service conditional gift fund.....	50,000	15,000	-35,000
Public Health Service unconditional gift fund.....	12,000	12,000	
St. Elizabeths Hospital patients' benefit fund.....	5,100	300	-4,800
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	87,100	47,300	-39,800
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
Railroad retirement account.....	768,800,000	775,500,000	+6,700,000
Railroad Unemployment Insurance Administration Fund.....	7,241,543	7,873,862	+632,319
Total, Railroad Retirement Board.....	776,041,543	783,373,862	+7,332,319
SOLDIERS' HOME			
Soldiers' Home permanent fund.....	6,500	6,500	
Total trust funds, all agencies.....	776,222,022	783,467,662	+7,245,640

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1957, ESTIMATES FOR 1958, AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1958

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House bill
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,775,000	\$1,619,000	\$1,430,000	\$1,480,000	—\$295,000	—\$139,000	
Revolving fund.....		150,000				—150,000	
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	1,775,000	1,769,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	—295,000	—289,000	
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR							
Salaries and expenses.....	2,021,000	2,263,000	2,021,000	2,191,000	+170,000	—72,000	+170,000
Transfer from highway trust fund.....	[300,000]	[365,000]	[365,000]		[—300,000]	[—365,000]	[—365,000]
Total, Office of the Solicitor.....	2,021,000	2,263,000	2,021,000	2,191,000	+170,000	—72,000	+170,000
BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS							
Salaries and expenses.....	911,500	1,167,000	985,000	985,000	+73,500	—182,000	
BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS							
Salaries and expenses.....	383,000	542,000	542,000	542,000	+159,000		
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,399,000	3,940,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	+201,000	—340,000	
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY							
Salaries and expenses.....	5,558,000	6,358,000	5,558,000	125,600	—5,432,400	—6,232,400	—5,432,400
Transfer from unemployment trust fund.....				[5,874,400]	[+5,874,400]	[+5,874,400]	[+5,874,400]
Grants to States.....	250,000,000	270,000,000	249,814,000	260,000,000	+10,000,000	—10,000,000	+10,186,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	70,000,000	42,000,000	36,800,000	36,800,000	—33,200,000	—5,200,000	

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House bill
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY—continued							
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.....	\$25,000,000	\$32,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	-----	-\$7,000,000	-----
Mexican farm labor program.....	2,125,000	2,683,000	2,236,200	2,500,000	+\$375,000	-183,000	+\$263,800
Total, Bureau of Employment Security.....	352,683,000	353,041,000	319,408,200	324,425,600	-28,257,400	-28,615,400	+5,017,400
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION							
Salaries and expenses.....	2,347,000	2,838,000	2,838,000	2,838,000	+491,000	-----	-----
Transfer from war claims fund.....	[78,500]	-----	-----	-----	[-78,500]	-----	-----
Transfer from longshoremen's and harbor workers trust fund.....	[47,000]	- [47,400]	[47,400]	[47,400]	-----	-----	-----
Employees' compensation fund (indefinite).....	[50,000,000]	[50,350,000]	[50,350,000]	Indefinite	Indefinite	Indefinite	Indefinite
Total, Bureau of Employees' Compensation.....	2,347,000	2,838,000	2,838,000	2,838,000	+491,000	-----	-----
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS							
Salaries and expenses.....	6,875,000	7,768,000	7,124,000	7,225,000	+350,000	-543,000	+101,000
WOMEN'S BUREAU							
Salaries and expenses.....	403,000	462,000	462,000	462,000	+59,000	-----	-----
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$9,988,000	\$10,888,000	\$10,600,000	\$10,600,000	+612,000	-288,000	-----
Total, Department of Labor.....	380,785,500	384,678,000	349,060,200	354,348,600	-26,436,900	-30,320,400	+5,288,400

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND									
Education of the blind	\$230,000	\$328,000	\$328,000	\$328,000	\$328,000	+\$98,000			
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION									
Salaries and expenses	6,779,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	+2,521,000			
Certification and inspection services	[1,200,000]	[1,254,500]	[1,254,500]	[1,254,500]	[1,254,500]	[+54,500]			
Total, Food and Drug Administration	6,779,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	+2,521,000			
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL									
Salaries and expenses	2,801,400	3,032,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+198,600			
GALLAUDET COLLEGE									
Salaries and expenses	615,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	+115,000			
Construction	2,547,000	1,690,000	1,690,000	1,690,000	1,690,000	-857,000			
Total, Gallaudet College	3,162,000	2,420,000	2,420,000	2,420,000	2,420,000	-742,000			
HOWARD UNIVERSITY									
Salaries and expenses	3,300,000	4,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	+500,000			
Plans and specifications		150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	+150,000			
Construction of buildings	100,000	262,000	262,000	262,000	262,000	+162,000			
Liquidation of contract authority	286,200					-286,200			
Total, Howard University	3,686,200	4,412,000	4,212,000	4,212,000	4,212,000	+525,800			
OFFICE OF EDUCATION									
Promotion and further development of vocational education	31,442,081	33,750,081	33,442,081	33,442,081	33,750,081	+2,308,000			
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500				
Grants for library services	2,050,000	3,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	+2,950,000			
Payments to school districts	113,050,000	127,000,000	127,000,000	127,000,000	127,000,000	+13,950,000			
Assistance for school construction	108,500,000	41,800,000	41,700,000	41,700,000	41,700,000	-66,800,000			

+\$308,000

+2,000,000

-100,000

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—continued							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$5,270,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	+\$1,730,000	—\$500,000	-----
President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.....	150,000	300,000	-----	200,000	+\$50,000	—100,000	+\$200,000
Grants for State Committees on Education Beyond the High School.....	-----	650,000	-----	-----	-----	—650,000	-----
Total, Office of Education.....	262,963,581	216,501,581	216,643,581	217,151,581	—45,812,000	+\$650,000	+\$508,000
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION							
Grants to States and other agencies.....	39,500,000	45,100,000	45,100,000	45,100,000	+\$5,600,000	-----	-----
Training and traineeships.....	2,950,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	+\$1,450,000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	1,160,000	1,445,000	1,330,000	1,330,000	+\$170,000	—115,000	-----
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	43,610,000	50,945,000	50,830,000	50,830,000	+\$7,220,000	—115,000	-----
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
Assistance to States, general.....	17,591,000	24,609,000	19,592,000	22,592,000	+\$5,001,000	—2,017,000	+\$3,000,000
Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska.....	1,170,000	2,165,000	2,165,000	2,165,000	+\$995,000	-----	-----
Veneral diseases.....	4,195,000	4,415,000	4,415,000	4,415,000	+\$220,000	-----	-----
Tuberculosis.....	6,660,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+\$340,000	-----	-----
Communicable diseases.....	5,750,000	6,260,000	6,200,000	6,250,000	+\$500,000	—10,000	+\$50,000
Sanitary engineering activities.....	9,000,000	13,063,000	12,640,000	12,640,000	+\$3,640,000	—423,000	-----
Grants for waste treatment works construction.....	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	—5,000,000	—5,000,000	—5,000,000
Grants for hospital construction.....	125,000,000	121,200,000	121,200,000	121,200,000	—3,800,000	-----	-----

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.....	1, 381, 000	1, 450, 000	1, 450, 000	1, 450, 000	+58, 000	-----
Hospitals and medical care.....	40, 195, 000	44, 399, 000	44, 399, 000	44, 399, 000	+4, 204, 000	-----
Foreign Quarantine Service.....	3, 315, 000	4, 026, 000	3, 876, 000	3, 876, 000	+561, 000	-----
Indian health activities.....	38, 775, 000	43, 990, 000	40, 000, 000	42, 500, 000	+3, 725, 000	-----
Construction of Indian health facilities.....	8, 762, 000	5, 800, 000	3, 096, 000	3, 096, 000	-5, 666, 000	-----
National Institutes of Health:						
General research and services.....	12, 122, 000	14, 026, 000	14, 026, 000	14, 026, 000	+1, 904, 000	-----
National Cancer Institute.....	48, 432, 000	46, 902, 000	46, 902, 000	58, 543, 000	+10, 111, 000	-----
Mental Health Activities.....	35, 197, 000	35, 217, 000	35, 217, 000	39, 421, 000	+4, 224, 000	-----
National Heart Institute.....	33, 396, 000	33, 436, 000	33, 436, 000	38, 784, 000	+5, 388, 000	-----
Dental health activities.....	6, 026, 000	6, 430, 000	6, 430, 000	6, 430, 000	+404, 000	-----
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.....	15, 885, 000	17, 885, 000	17, 885, 000	23, 548, 000	+7, 663, 000	-----
Allergy and infectious disease activities.....	13, 299, 000	17, 400, 000	17, 400, 000	17, 400, 000	+4, 101, 000	-----
Neurology and blindness activities.....	18, 650, 000	18, 887, 000	18, 887, 000	24, 053, 000	+5, 408, 000	-----
Grants for construction of research facilities.....	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	-----	-----
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.....	\$147, 000	-----	-----	-----	-\$147, 000	-----
Construction of animal quarters.....	1, 371, 000	-----	-----	-----	-1, 371, 000	-----
Construction of dental research building.....	200, 000	-----	-----	-----	-200, 000	-----
Construction of surgical facilities.....	1, 630, 000	-----	-----	-----	-1, 630, 000	-----
Construction of general office building.....	300, 000	-----	-----	-----	-300, 000	-----
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health.....	216, 655, 000	220, 183, 000	220, 183, 000	252, 210, 000	+35, 555, 000	-----
National Library of Medicine (operating expenses).....	-----	1, 450, 000	1, 450, 000	1, 450, 000	+1, 450, 000	-----
Construction of library facilities.....	350, 000	-----	-----	-----	-350, 000	-----
Retired pay of commissioned officers.....	1, 450, 000	1, 570, 000	-----	Indefinite	-1, 450, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	3, 892, 000	5, 150, 000	5, 100, 000	5, 100, 000	+1, 208, 000	-----
Total, Public Health Service.....	534, 141, 000	556, 730, 000	542, 766, 000	575, 343, 000	+41, 202, 000	-----
					+18, 613, 000	-----
					+32, 027, 000	-----
					+32, 027, 000	-----
					+1, 450, 000	-----
					-350, 000	-----
					-1, 450, 000	-----
					-50, 000	-----
					+18, 613, 000	-----
					+32, 577, 000	-----

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL						
Salaries and expenses.....	\$2,870,000	\$3,265,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,085,800	+\$215,800	-\$179,200
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds.....	270,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	-215,000	
Construction and equipment, maximum security building.....	7,494,000				-7,494,000	
Construction, treatment and cafeteria building.....		180,000	180,000	180,000	+180,000	
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	10,634,000	3,500,000	3,235,000	3,320,800	-7,313,200	+85,800
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.....	[121,500,000]	[131,000,000]	[130,000,000]	[130,000,000]	[+8,500,000]	[-1,000,000]
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.....				[5,710,000]	[+5,710,000]	[+5,710,000]
Grants to States for public assistance.....	1,575,000,000	1,679,400,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	+25,000,000	-79,400,000
Grants to States for training of public welfare personnel.....		2,500,000			+1,000,000	-2,500,000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.....	1,748,000	2,216,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	+152,000	-316,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.....	1,822,000	2,154,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+178,000	-154,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.....	39,361,000	41,500,000	41,500,000	41,500,000	+2,139,000	
Cooperative research or demonstration projects in social security.....		2,080,000				-2,080,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner:						
Appropriation.....	212,000	315,000	300,000	300,000	+88,000	-15,000
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[160,000]	[244,000]	[240,000]	[240,000]	[-80,000]	[-4,000]
Total, Social Security Administration.....	1,618,143,000	1,730,165,000	1,645,700,000	1,645,700,000	+29,557,000	-84,465,000

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses:									
Appropriation-----	1, 588, 000	2, 015, 000	1, 800, 000	1, 800, 000	+212, 000	-215, 000			
Transfer from OASI trust fund-----	[225, 000]	[282, 000]	[260, 000]	[260, 000]	[+35, 000]	[-22, 000]			
Office of Field Administration:									
Appropriation-----	1, 985, 000	2, 355, 000	2, 300, 000	2, 300, 000	+315, 000	-55, 000			
Transfer from OASI trust fund-----	[568, 000]	[708, 000]	[700, 000]	[700, 000]	[+132, 000]	[-8, 000]			
Office of the General Counsel:									
Appropriation-----	426, 000	559, 000	500, 000	500, 000	+74, 000	-59, 000			
Transfers-----	[419, 100]	[477, 000]	[450, 000]	[474, 000]	[+54, 900]	- [3, 000]			[+24, 000]
Surplus property utilization-----	450, 000	502, 000	502, 000	502, 000	+52, 000				
Total, Office of the Secretary-----	4, 449, 000	5, 431, 000	5, 102, 000	5, 102, 000	+653, 000	-329, 000			
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	2, 490, 599, 181	2, 582, 764, 581	2, 483, 536, 581	2, 516, 707, 381	+26, 108, 200	-66, 057, 200			+33, 170, 800]

TITLE III--NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$8, 951, 500	\$9, 575, 000	\$9, 384, 800	\$9, 384, 800	+\$433, 300	-\$190, 200			
----------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	--	--	--

TITLE IV--NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$475, 500	\$520, 000	\$520, 000	\$520, 000	+\$44, 500				
Arbitration and emergency boards-----	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000					
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses-----	436, 500	525, 000	525, 000	525, 000	+38, 500				
Total, National Mediation Board-----	1, 212, 000	1, 295, 000	1, 295, 000	1, 295, 000	+83, 000				

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1957, estimates for 1958, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1958—Con.

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Appropriations, 1957	Estimates, 1958
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation).....	\$[7, 600, 000]	\$[8, 150, 000]	\$[8, 150, 000]	\$[8, 150, 000]	[+\$550, 000]	

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses.....	\$3, 295, 000	\$3, 610, 000	\$3, 550, 000	\$3, 550, 000	+\$255, 000	—\$80, 000
Boards of inquiry.....	10, 000				—10, 000	
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	3, 305, 000	3, 610, 000	3, 550, 000	3, 550, 000	+245, 000	—60, 000

TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Federal contribution.....	\$5, 000	\$5, 000	\$5, 000	\$5, 000		
---------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--	--

TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Maintenance and operation.....	\$[6, 643, 000]	\$[4, 750, 000]	\$[4, 750, 000]	\$[4, 750, 000]	[—\$1, 893, 000]	
Grand total, all titles of the bill.....	2, 884, 858, 181	2, 981, 927, 581	2, 846, 831, 581	2, 885, 290, 781	+432, 600	—\$96, 636, 800
						+ \$38, 459, 200

○

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

Calendar No. 423

H. R. 6287

[Report No. 416]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 8, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 7, 1957

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 13, 1957, by Mr.
HILL, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health,
Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal
year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and
6 related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958,
7 namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; and purchase of uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131) ; \$1,480,000; of which not more than \$170,000 shall be for international labor affairs: *Provided, That the limitation of \$154,490 for international labor affairs appearing in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 423) is increased to \$159,490.*

Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet, in whole or in part, the requirements of the Department; and (4) telephone, mail and messenger services: *Provided, That any stocks of supplies and equip-*

1 of supplies and equipment and that the fund shall be reim-
 2 bursed in advance from available funds of bureaus, offices,
 3 and agencies for which services are performed at rates which
 4 will return in full all expenses of operations, including re-
 5 serves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equip-
 6 ment.

7 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 9 Office of the Solicitor, ~~\$2,024,000~~ \$2,191,000, together with
 10 not to exceed \$365,000 to be derived from the highway trust
 11 fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of
 12 1956.

13 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 15 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and
 16 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-
 17 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Fed-
 18 eral Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C.
 19 784 (c)) ; performance of the functions vested in the Sec-
 20 retary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act,
 21 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not less than
 22 \$182,575 for the work of the President's Committee on
 23 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as
 24 authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat.
 25 409) : *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for

1 the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or
2 transfer to any other department or agency under the pro-
3 visions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and
4 of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attend-
5 ance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences
6 concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards;
7 \$985,000.

8 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render
10 assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment
11 rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service
12 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the
13 Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended (50 U. S. C.
14 App. 351), the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel
15 Service Law of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 401),
16 and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service
17 Act (50 U. S. C. App. 459), and the Reserve Forces Act
18 of 1955 (69 Stat. 598), \$542,000.

19 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
21 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
22 tice training, as authorized by the Acts of March 4, 1913 (5
23 U. S. C. 611), and August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50),
24 \$3,600,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~\$5,558,000~~ \$6,000,000, of which \$5,874,400 shall be derived by transfer from the Federal unemployment account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and, of which \$1,125,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment, and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses including purchasing and installing of

1 air-conditioning equipment in connection with the operation
2 of employment office facilities and services in the District of
3 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
4 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Read-
5 justment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684) and title
6 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1130) ,
7 ~~\$249,814,000~~ \$260,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall
8 be available only to the extent necessary to meet increased
9 costs of administration resulting from changes in a State
10 law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims
11 paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in
12 State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the
13 State generally over those upon which the State's basic grant
14 (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based,
15 which increased costs of administration cannot be provided
16 for by normal budgetary adjustments: Provided, That not-
17 withstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302
18 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of
19 Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the
20 Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance
21 with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except
22 in the case of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, with
23 the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as
24 amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for
25 the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment

1 compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Pro-*
2 *vided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by
3 the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department
4 shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties
5 may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of
6 official mail matter in connection with the administration
7 of unemployment compensation systems and employment
8 services by States receiving grants therefrom.

9 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
10 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
11 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
12 maintenance of personnel standards on the merit basis, shall
13 apply.

14 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
15 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
16 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
17 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
18 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
19 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
20 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
21 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
22 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
23 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
24 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
25 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

1 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
2 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
3 to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as
4 amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended,
5 for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such
6 sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
7 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
8 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
9 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

10 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
11 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of
12 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
13 \$36,800,000.

14 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
15 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
16 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV of
17 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
18 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
19 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
20 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
21 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

22 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees:
23 For payments to unemployed Federal employees, either di-
24 rectly or through payments to States, as authorized by title
25 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$25,000,000.

1 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees,
 2 next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of
 3 the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized
 4 by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, such
 5 amounts as may be required for payment to unemployed
 6 Federal employees for the first quarter of the next succeeding
 7 fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder
 8 shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal
 9 year.

10 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
 11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
 12 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under
 13 the Act of July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119), as amended,
 14 including temporary employment of persons without regard
 15 to the civil service laws, ~~\$2,236,200~~ \$2,500,000.

16 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
 18 expenses and not to exceed \$113,400 for the Employees'
 19 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,838,000, together with
 20 not to exceed \$47,400 to be derived from the fund created
 21 by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers'
 22 Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906).

23 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
 24 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-

1 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
2 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
3 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
4 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau
5 of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of
6 benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War
7 Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation
8 Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of
9 recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical
10 and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral
11 and burial expenses, including transportation and other ex-
12 penses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial,
13 for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were
14 certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital
15 services and treatment at Government expense on June 30,
16 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian
17 employees of the United States, and the limitations and
18 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended
19 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,
20 treatment, and expenses in such cases and for payments pur-
21 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act
22 of 1948 (50 U. S. C., app. 2012) ; such amount as may be
23 required during the current fiscal year.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$7,124,000~~ \$7,225,000.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$462,000.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-

ferences concerned with the work of the Division,
\$10,600,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1958".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101–105), \$328,000.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301–392) ; the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41–50) ; the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141–149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401–411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61–64) ; *including purchase of not*

1 *to exceed eighty-nine passenger motor vehicles of which fifty-*
2 *one shall be for replacement only;* reporting and illustrating
3 the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, appa-
4 ratus, and scientific equipment; payment in advance for
5 special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees,
6 travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new
7 developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement
8 operations; \$9,300,000.

9 Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and
10 other services: For expenses necessary for the certification
11 or inspection of certain products, and for the establishment
12 of tolerances for pesticides, in accordance with sections 406,
13 408, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal
14 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.
15 346, 346a, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the ag-
16 gregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal
17 year to cover payments of fees for services in connec-
18 tion with such certifications, inspections, or establishment of
19 tolerances, to remain available until expended. The total
20 amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal
21 services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific
22 equipment; *purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor*
23 *vehicles for replacement only;* expenses of advisory commit-
24 tees; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service
25 has been rendered.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the

1 Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed
2 upon him by the foregoing proviso.

3 GALLAUDET COLLEGE

4 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Gal-
5 laudet College, including personal services and miscellaneous
6 expenses, and repairs and improvements, as authorized by
7 the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law 420), \$730,000:
8 *Provided*, That Gallaudet College shall be paid by the
9 District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each
10 quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per school year for each
11 student attending and receiving instruction in elementary
12 or secondary education pursuant to the Act of March 1,
13 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

14 Construction: For the construction and equipment of
15 buildings and facilities on the grounds of Gallaudet College,
16 as authorized by the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law
17 420), under the supervision of the General Services Admin-
18 istration, including planning, architectural, and engineering
19 services, \$1,690,000, to remain available until June 30,
20 1959, as follows: For a cafeteria and service building and a
21 men's dormitory, together with alterations, installations, and
22 equipment in connection with such construction, and for
23 beginning roads, walks, and grading in connection with such
24 construction.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$3,800,000.

Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University, of a physical education building and a home economics building, \$150,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959.

Construction of buildings: For equipping the dental school building under the supervision of General Services Administration, \$262,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959, and such amount shall be in addition to the limitation of cost established by Public Law 452, Eighty-second Congress.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 2; 70 Stat. 1126), and section 202 of said Act (70 Stat. 925), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31),

1 *and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 909),*
 2 *including \$4,000,000 for extension and improvement of*
 3 *practical nurse training, and \$228,000 for vocational educa-*
 4 *tion in the fishery trades and industry including distributive*
 5 *occupations therein, ~~\$33,442,081~~ \$33,750,081: Provided,*
 6 *That the apportionment to the States under section 3 (a),*
 7 *(1), (2), (3), and (4) of the Vocational Education Act*
 8 *of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed*
 9 *\$29,267,081 for the current fiscal year: Provided further,*
 10 *That the amount of allotment which States and Territories*
 11 *are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other*
 12 *States and Territories applying therefor for use in the pro-*
 13 *grams for which the funds were originally apportioned.*

14 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
 15 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section
 16 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C.
 17 329), \$2,501,500.

18 Grants for library services: For grants to the States
 19 pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1956, as amended (70 Stat.
 20 293-296, 911), \$5,000,000: *Provided, That the amount of*
 21 *any State's allotment from this appropriation which such*
 22 *State certifies will remain unpaid to it on June 30, 1959,*
 23 *may be reallocated by the Commissioner among other States*
 24 *applying therefor in proportion to their rural population,*

1 and deemed part of such allotments, except that no State's
2 allotment shall be so increased as to exceed the allotment
3 which would be made to it were this appropriation equal
4 to the maximum authorized under such Act.

5 Payments to school districts: For payments to local edu-
6 cational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
7 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as
8 amended (20 U. S. C. ch. 13; 70 Stat. 909, 970-972),
9 \$127,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also
10 be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of
11 such Act.

12 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
13 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
14 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized
15 by title III and title IV of the Act of September 23, 1950,
16 as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14; 70 Stat. 909, 968-969),
17 including not to exceed \$700,000 for necessary expenses of
18 technical services rendered by other agencies and not to
19 exceed \$5,000,000 for title IV, \$41,700,000, to remain
20 available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That no part of
21 this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
22 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and
23 Welfare.

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the

1 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations,
2 and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of
3 public and school library service; coordination of library
4 service on the national level with other forms of adult educa-
5 tion; developing library participation in Federal projects;
6 fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among
7 libraries, interstate library coordination and the development
8 of library service throughout the country; purchase, distri-
9 bution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
10 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
11 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
12 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
13 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
14 and repairing the same; and cooperative research, surveys,
15 and demonstrations in education as authorized by the Act of
16 July 26, 1954 (20 U. S. C. 331-332) ; \$7,000,000, of
17 which not less than \$550,000 shall be available for the
18 Division of Vocational Education as authorized.

19 *President's Committee on Education Beyond the High*
20 *School: For salaries and expenses for the President's Com-*
21 *mittee on Education Beyond the High School, including serv-*
22 *ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946*
23 *(5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings,*
24 *\$200,000.*

1 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

2 Grants to States and other agencies: For grants to
3 States and other agencies in accordance with the Voca-
4 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$45,100,000, of which
5 \$40,000,000 is for vocational rehabilitation services under
6 section 2 of said Act; \$1,500,000 is for extension and im-
7 provement projects under section 3 of said Act; and
8 \$3,600,000 is for special projects under section 4 of said
9 Act: *Provided*, That allotments under section 2 of said Act
10 to the States for the current fiscal year shall be made on
11 the basis of \$53,000,000, and this amount shall be con-
12 sidered the sum available for allotments under such section
13 for such fiscal year.

14 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
15 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, grants to States
16 under sections 2 and 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
17 as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding
18 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
19 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged
20 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*,
21 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall
22 not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter
23 of the current fiscal year.

24 Training and traineeships: For training and traineeships
25 pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,

1 as amended, and for carrying out the training functions
2 provided for in section 7 of said Act, \$4,400,000.

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
4 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
5 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
6 U. S. C., ch. 6A), as amended, \$1,330,000.

7 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

8 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
9 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
10 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, in-
11 cluding expenses for active commissioned officers in the
12 Reserve Corps and for not to exceed one thousand six
13 hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps;
14 and except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September
15 30, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 236-244), for expenses of primary
16 and secondary schooling of dependents of Public Health
17 Service personnel stationed in foreign countries, in amounts
18 not to exceed an average of \$250 per student, when it is
19 determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, avail-
20 able in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the
21 education of such dependents, and for the transportation
22 of such dependents between such schools and their places
23 of residence when the schools are not accessible to such
24 dependents by regular means of transportation; and for

1 the payment of compensation to consultants or individual
2 scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to
3 section 207 (e) or section 207 (f) of the Act at rates
4 established by the Surgeon General not to exceed \$15,000
5 per annum; as follows:

6 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
7 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c)
8 of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pur-
9 suant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations
10 and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; to
11 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,
12 and vital statistics; to provide traineeships pursuant to sec-
13 tion 306 of the Act; and not to exceed \$1,000 for enter-
14 tainment of officials of other countries when specifically
15 authorized by the Surgeon General; ~~\$19,592,000~~ \$22,592,000.

16 Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska: To en-
17 able the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to
18 cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the con-
19 duct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention,
20 treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and
21 maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to
22 and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314
23 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f),
24 (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c)
25 of such section), 361, 363, and 371 of the Act, including

1 the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the
2 purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings,
3 \$2,165,000.

4 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
5 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
6 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
7 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
8 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
9 ment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act,
10 and with the approval of the respective State health author-
11 ities, to counties, health districts, and other political sub-
12 divisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
13 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
14 General may determine; \$4,415,000.

15 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
16 (b) of the Act, \$7,000,000, of which not less than
17 \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States,
18 to be matched by an equal amount of State and local
19 funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of
20 prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees,
21 and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and
22 case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used
23 directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but ex-
24 cluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria.

25 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-

1 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and
2 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
3 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate
4 transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
5 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,
6 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$6,200,000
7 \$6,250,000.

8 Sanitary engineering activities: For expenses, not other-
9 wise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of
10 sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the Act relating
11 to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, in-
12 cluding enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and inter-
13 state quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the pur-
14 poses of the Acts of July 14, 1955 (Public Law 159), and
15 July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), including \$2,700,000 for
16 grants to States and \$300,000 for grants to interstate agen-
17 cies; and the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;
18 \$12,640,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958.

19 ~~Grants for waste treatment works construction: For~~
20 ~~payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control~~
21 ~~Act, as amended, \$50,000,000, to remain available only~~
22 ~~until June 30, 1959.~~

23 *Grants for waste treatment works construction: For*
24 *payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control*
25 *Act, as amended (70 Stat. 502), \$45,000,000 which to-*

1 *gether with the amount appropriated under this head in the*
2 *Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat.*
3 *769) shall be applied to payment on account of allotments*
4 *made for the current and preceding fiscal years pursuant to*
5 *said Act, such sums to remain available only until June*
6 *30, 1959: Provided, That allotments under such section 6*
7 *for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of*
8 *\$50,000,000.*

9 Grants for hospital construction: For payments under
10 parts C and G, title VI, of the Act, as amended, \$121,-
11 200,000, of which \$99,000,000 shall be for payments for
12 hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,200,-
13 000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636 of
14 the Act, and \$21,000,000 shall be for payments for facili-
15 ties pursuant to part G, as follows: \$6,500,000 for diag-
16 nostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the
17 chronically ill and impaired, \$4,000,000 for rehabilitation
18 facilities, and \$4,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided, That*
19 *allotments under such parts C and G to the several States*
20 *for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of*
21 *amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.*

22 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
23 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
24 of the Act, as amended, \$1,450,000.

25 *Surveys and planning for hospital construction: The*

1 *funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Ap-*
2 *propriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 810) shall remain available*
3 *for expenditure until June 30, 1959.*

4 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
5 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August
6 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), *including \$1,186,000 to be avail-*
7 *able only for payments for medical care of dependents and*
8 *retired personnel* under the Dependents' Medical Care
9 Act (70 Stat. 250-254), and under sections 307, 321,
10 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and
11 810 of the Public Health Service Act, Private Law 419
12 of the Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and Executive
13 Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and
14 exchange of farm products and livestock; conducting research
15 on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative
16 nursing services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;
17 \$44,399,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively avail-
18 able for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and
19 treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided, That*
20 *when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a*
21 *health service program for any department or agency, pay-*
22 *ment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for*
23 *deposit to the credit of this appropriation.*

24 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
25 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-

ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available, including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries, \$3,876,000.

Indian health activities: For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 2001), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) (including not to exceed \$10,000 for such services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals, when authorized by the Surgeon General) ; *purchase of not to exceed seventy-five passenger motor vehicles, of which fifty shall be for replacement only*; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; ~~\$40,000,000~~ \$42,500,000.

Construction of Indian health facilities: For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for per-

sonnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; and purchase of trailers; \$3,096,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior at the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

National Institutes of Health, general research and services: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects *and training grants* pursuant to section 301 of the Act; regulation and preparation of biologic products, and conduct of research related thereto; *purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only*; not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$14,026,000.

National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of operation are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established

1 *the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such*
2 *amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health*
3 *may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of es-*
4 *timated costs among the various appropriations involved may*
5 *be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available*
6 *for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as*
7 *may be prescribed by said Director, including not to exceed*
8 *\$2,500 each fiscal year for entertainment of visiting scien-*
9 *tists when specifically approved by said Director, and for the*
10 *operation of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and*
11 *others at rates to be determined by said Director to be suffi-*
12 *cient to cover the cost of such operation and the proceeds*
13 *thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: Provided,*
14 *That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in*
15 *the fiscal year in which they are advanced: Provided further,*
16 *That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual*
17 *costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appro-*
18 *priations from which such funds are advanced.*

19 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
20 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
21 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
22 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
23 State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit
24 institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of
25 cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations,

1 and grants-in-aid; and to contract for supplies and services
 2 by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Re-
 3 vised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy pro-
 4 gram; and to contract on a cost or other basis for supplies
 5 and services by negotiation, without regard to section 3709
 6 of the Revised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy
 7 program, including indemnification of contractors to the
 8 extent and subject to the limitations provided in title 10,
 9 United States Code, section 2354, except that approval and
 10 certification required thereby shall be by the Surgeon General;
 11 and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A,
 12 of the Act; ~~\$46,902,000~~ \$58,543,000.

13 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
 14 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 304,
 15 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental
 16 diseases, ~~\$35,217,000~~ \$39,421,000, together with not to ex-
 17 ceed \$4,573,000 of the unobligated balance of the fiscal year
 18 1957 appropriation granted under this head: Provided, That
 19 the Chief and Assistant Chief of the Training and Standards
 20 Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health shall each
 21 be compensated at a salary rate not to exceed \$17,500 per
 22 annum.

23 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
 24 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
 25 ~~\$33,436,000~~ \$38,784,000.

1 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
 2 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
 3 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
 4 diseases and conditions, \$6,430,000.

5 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
 6 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
 7 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, ~~\$17,885,000~~
 8 *\$23,548,000*.

9 Allergy and infectious disease activities: For expenses,
 10 not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the pur-
 11 poses of the Act relating to allergy and infectious diseases,
 12 \$17,400,000, of which \$150,000 shall be available for pay-
 13 ment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and
 14 operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

15 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-
 16 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
 17 neurology and blindness, ~~\$18,887,000~~ *\$24,058,000*.

18 Grants for construction of health research facilities: For
 19 grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of
 20 1956, \$30,000,000.

21 National Library of Medicine: For expenses, not other-
 22 wise provided for, necessary to carry out the National
 23 Library of Medicine Act (70 Stat. 960), \$1,450,000.

24 *Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of*
 25 *commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments*

1 *under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of*
 2 *1953, such amount as may be required during the current*
 3 *fiscal year.*

4 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
 5 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous ex-
 6 penses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
 7 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and
 8 publications related to public health; and conducting
 9 studies and demonstrations in public health methods;
 10 \$5,100,000.

11 ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

12 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 13 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including cloth-
 14 ing for patients, and cooperation with organizations or
 15 individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes,
 16 prevention and treatment of mental illness, ~~\$3,000,000~~
 17 \$3,085,800.

18 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
 19 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
 20 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prepara-
 21 tion of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision
 22 of construction, \$55,000, to remain available until June 30,
 23 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be
 24 transferred to the General Services Administration.

25 Construction, treatment and cafeteria building: For

1 expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifi-
 2 cations for a treatment and cafeteria building at Saint
 3 Elizabeths Hospital, \$180,000, to remain available until
 4 June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may
 5 be transferred to General Services Administration.

6 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

7 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
 8 Insurance: For necessary expenses, not more than
 9 \$130,000,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age
 10 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That such
 11 amounts as are required shall be available to pay the cost
 12 of necessary travel incident to medical examinations for
 13 verifying disabilities of individuals who file applications for
 14 disability determinations under title II of the Social Security
 15 Act, as amended.

16 Advances to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
 17 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, advances to
 18 States under section 221 (e) of the Social Security Act, as
 19 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
 20 year, such sums as may be necessary from the above author-
 21 ization may be expended from the Federal old-age and
 22 survivors insurance trust fund.

23 *Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insur-*
 24 *ance: For an additional amount for "Construction, Bureau*
 25 *of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance" for construction of*

1 an office building and appurtenant facilities, including ac-
 2 quisition of land, \$5,710,000, to be derived from the Federal
 3 Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which, to-
 4 gether with sums heretofore appropriated for these purposes,
 5 shall establish a limitation of cost of \$31,080,000: *Provided,*
 6 *That the established limit of cost may be exceeded or shall*
 7 *be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage increase*
 8 *or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating*
 9 *from October 1, 1956, as determined by the Administrator,*
 10 *General Services Administration, and the amount to be de-*
 11 *rived from the aforesaid trust fund shall be increased or*
 12 *decreased accordingly: Provided further, That the immedi-*
 13 *ately preceding proviso shall be effective only if a contract*
 14 *for construction is executed on or before December 1, 1957.*

15 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
 16 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid
 17 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
 18 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social
 19 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
 20 X, and XIV), \$1,600,000,000, of which such amount as
 21 may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period
 22 in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year:
 23 *Provided,* That not more than \$104,000,000 of the amount
 24 herein appropriated shall be used for expenses of State and
 25 local administration: *Provided further,* That none of the

1 amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs
2 of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1,
3 1957.

4 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
5 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
6 \$1,900,000.

7 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
8 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
9 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
10 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
11 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-
12 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
13 \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation
14 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
15 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the
16 care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
17 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
18 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
19 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
20 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund,
21 so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
22 That any State plan which provides standards for professional
23 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
24 shall be approved.

25 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For

1 grants to States for maternal and child-health services,
2 services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
3 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
4 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
5 \$41,500,000, of which \$15,000,000 shall be available for
6 services for crippled children, \$16,500,000 for maternal and
7 child-health services, and \$10,000,000 for child-welfare
8 services: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
9 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
10 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
11 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
12 estimated to be expended by the State: *Provided further*,
13 That \$1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502
14 (b) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for
15 mentally retarded children.

16 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
17 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of
18 Social Security, \$300,000, together with not to exceed
19 \$240,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
20 survivors insurance trust fund.

21 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
22 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
23 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, and section 705
24 of title VII, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as
25 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal

1 year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

5 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan was submitted for approval.

14 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

15 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,800,000, together with not to exceed \$260,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

19 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration: For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Administration, \$2,300,000, together with not to exceed \$700,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

24 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,

1 \$500,000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 to be trans-
2 ferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certi-
3 fication and inspection services", and not to exceed ~~\$425,000~~
4 ~~\$449,000~~ to be transferred from the Federal old-age and sur-
5 vivors insurance trust fund.

6 Surplus property utilization: For expenses necessary for
7 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j), (k), (n),
8 and (o), of the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-
9 ices Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real
10 and personal excess property for educational purposes and
11 protection of public health, \$502,000.

12 GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
14 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in
15 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organ-
16 izations whose publications are available to members only
17 or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

18 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
19 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
20 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
21 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

22 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
23 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses
24 and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with

1 the functions or activities for which such appropriations are
2 made.

3 SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for
4 salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or
5 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
6 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131).

7 SEC. 206. None of the funds appropriated by this title
8 to the Social Security Administration for grants-in-aid of
9 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
10 operation of said agencies, including the salaries and ex-
11 penses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be
12 withheld from the said agencies of any States which have
13 established by legislative enactment and have in operation
14 a merit system and classification and compensation plan
15 covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation
16 of their employees, because of any disapproval of their per-
17 sonnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of
18 the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or
19 employees.

20 SEC. 207. The Secretary is authorized to make such
21 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,
22 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
23 out the operations of the Department.

24 SEC. 208. None of the funds provided herein shall be

1 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a
2 research project an amount for indirect expenses in con-
3 nection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of
4 the direct costs.

5 SEC. 209. None of the obligational authority available
6 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for
7 planning and/or construction of buildings shall remain avail-
8 able after June 30, 1959: *Provided, That existing obliga-*
9 *tional authority to the Department of Health, Education,*
10 *and Welfare for preparation of plans and specifications for*
11 *the construction of the general office and the dental research*
12 *buildings of the National Institutes of Health, and the Na-*
13 *tional Library of Medicine building of the Public Health*
14 *Service, shall remain available until June 30, 1958.*

15 SEC. 210. None of the funds provided herein shall be
16 used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or plan-
17 ning of any building for the Department of Health, Educa-
18 tion, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor
19 shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the
20 salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone
21 in connection with the construction or planning of any
22 building for the Department of Health, Education, and
23 Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

24 SEC. 211. *To the extent and under the conditions pro-*
25 *vided by regulations of the Secretary, officers (including*

1 *commissioned officers of the Public Health Service) and em-*
 2 *ployees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*
 3 *may hereafter, in connection with their attendance at meet-*
 4 *ings or in performing advisory services concerned with the*
 5 *functions or activities of the Department, be permitted to*
 6 *accept payment, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal agen-*
 7 *cies, organizations, and individuals, for travel and subsistence*
 8 *expenses, to be retained by them to cover the cost thereof or*
 9 *deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost*
 10 *thereof is paid, as may be provided in such regulations.*

11 This title may be cited as the "Department of Health,
 12 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958".

13 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS
 14 BOARD

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 16 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
 17 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
 18 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses
 19 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the
 20 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the
 21 General Counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of
 22 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and uniforms,
 23 or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of Sep-
 24 tember 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131);
 25 \$9,384,800: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation

1 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agri-
2 cultural laborers or used in connection with investiga-
3 tions, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining
4 units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in
5 section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U. S. C.
6 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations
7 Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of
8 June 25, 1938 (29 U. S. C. 203), and including in said
9 definition employees engaged in the maintenance and opera-
10 tion of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when
11 maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at
12 least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby
13 is used for farming purposes.

14 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
16 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
17 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
18 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$520,000.

19 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
20 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the
21 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and
22 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to
23 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including steno-
24 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the
25 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$250,000.

1 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
4 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
5 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$525,000, of which not
6 less than \$155,000 shall be available for compensation (at
7 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees
8 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
9 as amended.

10 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

11 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
12 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
13 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
14 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board,
15 when specifically authorized by the Board; stenographic
16 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
17 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and uniforms or allow-
18 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,
19 1954 (68 Stat. 1114) ; \$8,150,000, to be derived from the
20 railroad retirement account.

21 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
22 CONCILIATION SERVICE

23 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
24 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
25 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180,

1 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
2 as provided in section 205 of said Act; expenses of boards of
3 inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206
4 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, concil-
5 iators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess
6 of \$75 per diem; *Government listed telephones in private*
7 *residences and private apartments for official use in cities*
8 *where mediators are officially stationed, but no Federal*
9 *mediation and conciliation service office is maintained;*
10 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement
11 only at not to exceed \$3,000; expenses of attendance at
12 meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and
13 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
14 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,550,000.

15 TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE
16 POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

17 Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac
18 River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to
19 pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac
20 River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses
21 of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the
22 administration of its business in the conservancy district
23 established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat.
24 748), \$5,000.

1 TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

2 For maintenance and operation of the United States Sol-
3 diers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent
4 fund, \$4,750,000, of which \$34,000 shall remain available
5 until June 30, 1959 for construction of buildings and facili-
6 ties, including demolition: *Provided*, That this appropriation
7 shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of
8 members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at
9 rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the
10 Army, upon the recommendation of the Board of Commis-
11 sioners of the Home and the Surgeon General of the Army.

12 TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this
14 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not
15 authorized by the Congress.

16 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor,
17 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act,
18 1958."

Passed the House of Representatives April 4, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6287

[Report No. 416]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

APRIL 8, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 7, 1957

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 13, 1957
For actions of June 12, 1957
85th-1st, No. 101

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,18,20	Farm program.....17	Price supports.....19
Area development.....5	Foreign aid.....2,7	Research.....6,16,21
Atomic energy.....6,7,23	Forestry.....9	Small business.....14,22
Budget.....18	Inflation.....13	Soil conservation.....12
Chemicals.....16	Legislative program.....7	Transportation.....3,8
Contract carriers.....7	Loans, farm.....10	Water.....4,7
Contracts.....11	Personnel.....15	Wildlife.....16
Cotton.....19		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed: Independent offices appropriation bill. Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Senate debated mutual security authorization bill. Sen. Eastland introduced and discussed bill to provide alternative acreage-adjustment and price-support program for cotton. Sen. Bennett introduced and discussed bill to require costs estimates by BB on proposed projects.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 6070, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1958, adopting the committee amendments (pp. 7957-8), with additional amendments by Sen. Dirksen, to increase the funds for GSA's Transportation and Public Utilities Service for their appearances before rate-making bodies (p. 7958); and by Sen. Johnston, to increase the expense limitation of the Civil Service Commission to allow it to take over certain employee beneficial associations (pp. 7959-62). pp. 7954-68

Passed as reported H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958. pp. ~~7968~~, 7969-76, 7977-85

Sens. Morse and Pastore corrected some of their statements on the D. C. appropriation bill. pp. 7976-7

2. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on S. 2130, the mutual security authorization bill. pp. 7987-94, 7999-8001

The Foreign Relations Committee, in S. Rept. 417, on S. 2130, the mutual security bill, stated in part as follows:

"The bill, which is drawn in terms of amendments to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, makes a number of fundamental changes in that act and adds some further refinements. Its most important provisions are:

"1. Military assistance and defense support are authorized for 2 years instead of 1.

"2. A development loan fund is created to make loans and to engage in financial transactions, other than grants or purchase of equity securities, designed to promote the economic development of less developed countries. Appropriations of \$500 million are authorized for fiscal 1958, and in addition the fund is authorized to borrow from the Treasury \$750 million in each of fiscal years 1959 and 1960. This new lending authority, which will be used to supplement the activities of private enterprise, the Export-Import Bank, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, replaces the former Mutual Security Act provisions for development assistance.

"3. The bill provides a sliding scale for reducing the percentage of United States contributions to the United Nations technical assistance program. According to this scale, United States contributions which this year amount to approximately 49 percent, will be reduced to 45 percent in 1958, to 38 percent in 1959, and to 33.33 percent in 1960. Within the 45 percent limitation, an appropriation of \$15.5 million is authorized for 1958. The bill also authorizes \$151.9 million for the United States bilateral technical assistance program and \$1.5 million for contribution to the technical assistance program of the Organization of American States.

"4. Special assistance in the amount of \$250 million is authorized to supplement program funds to meet unforeseen changes or to meet special or unforeseen situations. Of this amount, \$100 million may be used, as in past years, in the President's discretion without regard to the other requirements of the act when the President determines such use to be important to the security of the United States. The remainder, or \$150 million, is designed to meet situations which could not otherwise be met under the more stringent terms written into the bill this year in regard to defense support and development loans. In addition, \$25 million, of which 90 percent must be in loans, is separately authorized for economic development in Latin America.

"5. Provision is also made for an additional contribution of \$220 million to NATO infrastructure, for continuing assistance to West Berlin, for assistance to various classes of migrants, refugees, and escapees, for contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund, to Arab refugees from Palestine, to the civilian activities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for the atoms for peace program, and for payment of ocean freight charges on private relief shipments.

"6. A program of malaria eradication is specifically authorized for the first time, to be financed mainly out of technical cooperation and special assistance funds.

"7. The limitation of 31.5 percent on United States contributions to the U. N. Food and Agriculture Organization is increased to 33.33 percent."

"Section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, required the use in fiscal year 1956 of not to exceed \$300 million and in fiscal year 1957 of not to exceed \$250 million of funds made available under the act to finance the export and sale for foreign currencies of surplus agricultural products. Section 8 (c) of S. 2130 requires the use of not to exceed \$200 million for that purpose in fiscal 1958.

"In the event surplus agricultural commodity exports are financed through the Development Loan Fund they may not be counted toward this total of \$200 million.

85TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6287

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 12, 1957

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and
6 related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958,
7 namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; and purchase of uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131) ; \$1,480,000~~(1)~~,—of which not more than \$170,000 shall be for international labor affairs~~(2)~~: *Provided, That the limitation of \$154,490 for international labor affairs appearing in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 423) is increased to \$159,490.*

Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet, in whole or in part, the requirements of the Department; and (4) telephone, mail and messenger services: *Provided, That any stocks of supplies and equip-*

1 of supplies and equipment and that the fund shall be reim-
 2 bursed in advance from available funds of bureaus, offices,
 3 and agencies for which services are performed at rates which
 4 will return in full all expenses of operations, including re-
 5 serves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equip-
 6 ment.

7 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 9 Office of the Solicitor, ~~(3)\$2,021,000~~ \$2,191,000~~(4), to-~~
 10 ~~gether with not to exceed \$365,000 to be derived from the~~
 11 ~~highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway~~
 12 ~~Revenue Act of 1956.~~

13 BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

14 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 15 promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and
 16 amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; per-
 17 formance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Fed-
 18 eral Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C.
 19 784 (c)) ; performance of the functions vested in the Sec-
 20 retary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act,
 21 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not less than
 22 \$182,575 for the work of the President's Committee on
 23 National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as
 24 authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat.
 25 409) : *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for

1 the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or
2 transfer to any other department or agency under the pro-
3 visions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and
4 of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attend-
5 ance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences
6 concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards;
7 \$985,000.

8 BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render
10 assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment
11 rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service
12 Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the
13 Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended (50 U. S. C.
14 App. 351), the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel
15 Service Law of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 401),
16 and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service
17 Act (50 U. S. C. App. 459), and the Reserve Forces Act
18 of 1955 (69 Stat. 598), \$542,000.

19 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
21 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
22 tice training, as authorized by the Acts of March 4, 1913 (5
23 U. S. C. 611), and August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50),
24 \$3,600,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~(5)\$5,558,~~
~~000 \$6,000,000, (6)~~*of which \$5,874,400 shall be derived by transfer from the Federal unemployment account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and, of which \$1,125,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.*

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment, and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses including purchasing and installing of

1 air-conditioning equipment in connection with the operation
2 of employment office facilities and services in the District of
3 Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for,
4 necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Read-
5 justment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684) and title
6 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1130),
7 ~~(7)\$249,844,000~~ *\$260,000,000*~~(8)~~, of which *\$10,000,000*
8 *shall be available only to the extent necessary to meet increased*
9 *costs of administration resulting from changes in a State*
10 *law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims*
11 *paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in*
12 *State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the*
13 *State generally over those upon which the State's basic grant*
14 *(or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based,*
15 *which increased costs of administration cannot be provided*
16 *for by normal budgetary adjustments: Provided, That not-*
17 *withstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302*
18 *(a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of*
19 *Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the*
20 *Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance*
21 *with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except*
22 *in the case of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, with*
23 *the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as*
24 *amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for*
25 *the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment*

1 compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Pro-*
2 *vided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by
3 the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department
4 shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties
5 may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of
6 official mail matter in connection with the administration
7 of unemployment compensation systems and employment
8 services by States receiving grants therefrom.

9 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
10 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
11 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and
12 maintenance of personnel standards on the merit basis, shall
13 apply.

14 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
15 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
16 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
17 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
18 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
19 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
20 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
21 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
22 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
23 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
24 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
25 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

1 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
2 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
3 to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as
4 amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended,
5 for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such
6 sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
7 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
8 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
9 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

10 Unemployment compensation for veterans: For pay-
11 ments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of
12 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952,
13 \$36,800,000.

14 Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeed-
15 ing fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current
16 fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV of
17 the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such
18 sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter
19 of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and
20 expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropria-
21 tion therefor for that fiscal year.

22 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees:
23 For payments to unemployed Federal employees, either di-
24 rectly or through payments to States, as authorized by title
25 XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$25,000,000.

1 Unemployment compensation for Federal employees,
 2 next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of
 3 the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized
 4 by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, such
 5 amounts as may be required for payment to unemployed
 6 Federal employees for the first quarter of the next succeeding
 7 fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder
 8 shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal
 9 year.

10 Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program:
 11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
 12 carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under
 13 the Act of July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119), as amended,
 14 including temporary employment of persons without regard
 15 to the civil service laws, ~~(9)\$2,236,200~~ \$2,500,000.

16 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
 18 expenses and not to exceed \$113,400 for the Employees'
 19 Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,838,000, together with
 20 not to exceed \$47,400 to be derived from the fund created
 21 by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers'
 22 Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906).

23 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
 24 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except ad-

1 ministrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
2 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
3 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
4 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau
5 of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of
6 benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War
7 Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation
8 Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of
9 recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical
10 and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral
11 and burial expenses, including transportation and other ex-
12 penses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial,
13 for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were
14 certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital
15 services and treatment at Government expense on June 30,
16 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian
17 employees of the United States, and the limitations and
18 authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended
19 (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services,
20 treatment, and expenses in such cases and for payments pur-
21 suant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act
22 of 1948 (50 U. S. C., app. 2012) ; such amount as may be
23 required during the current fiscal year.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(10)~~\$7,124,000 \$7,225,000.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$462,000.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at con-

1 ferences concerned with the work of the Division,
2 \$10,600,000.

3 GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
5 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
6 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
7 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and for expenses of attendance at meetings
8 concerned with the function or activity for which any such
9 appropriation is made.

10 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
11 Appropriation Act, 1958".

12 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCA- 13 TION, AND WELFARE

14 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

15 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
16 March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101-105),
17 \$328,000.

18 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

19 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carry-
20 ing out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as
21 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392) ; the Tea Importation Act,
22 as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk Act
23 (21 U. S. C. 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act
24 (15 U. S. C. 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as
25 amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64) ; ~~(11)~~including purchase of

1 *not to exceed eighty-nine passenger motor vehicles of which*
2 *fifty-one shall be for replacement only; reporting and illus-*
3 *trating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals,*
4 *apparatus, and scientific equipment; payment in advance for*
5 *special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees,*
6 *travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new*
7 *developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement*
8 *operations; \$9,300,000.*

9 Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and
10 other services: For expenses necessary for the certification
11 or inspection of certain products, and for the establishment
12 of tolerances for pesticides, in accordance with sections 406,
13 408, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal
14 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.
15 346, 346a, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the ag-
16 gregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal
17 year to cover payments of fees for services in connec-
18 tion with such certifications, inspections, or establishment of
19 tolerances, to remain available until expended. The total
20 amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal
21 services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific
22 equipment; ~~(12)~~*purchase of not to exceed four passenger*
23 *motor vehicles for replacement only; expenses of advisory*
24 *committees; and the refund of advance deposits for which*
25 *no service has been rendered.*

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the

1 Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed
2 upon him by the foregoing proviso.

3 GALLAUDET COLLEGE

4 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Gal-
5 laudet College, including personal services and miscellaneous
6 expenses, and repairs and improvements, as authorized by
7 the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law 420), \$730,000:
8 *Provided*, That Gallaudet College shall be paid by the
9 District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each
10 quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per school year for each
11 student attending and receiving instruction in elementary
12 or secondary education pursuant to the Act of March 1,
13 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

14 Construction: For the construction and equipment of
15 buildings and facilities on the grounds of Gallaudet College,
16 as authorized by the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law
17 420), under the supervision of the General Services Admin-
18 istration, including planning, architectural, and engineering
19 services, \$1,690,000, to remain available until June 30,
20 1959, as follows: For a cafeteria and service building and a
21 men's dormitory, together with alterations, installations, and
22 equipment in connection with such construction, and for
23 beginning roads, walks, and grading in connection with such
24 construction.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$3,800,000.

Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University, of a physical education building and a home economics building, \$150,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959.

Construction of buildings: For equipping the dental school building under the supervision of General Services Administration, \$262,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959, and such amount shall be in addition to the limitation of cost established by Public Law 452, Eighty-second Congress.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 2(13); 70 Stat. 1126), and section 202 of said Act (70 Stat. 925), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31),

1 (14) and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat.
 2 909), including \$4,000,000 for extension and improvement
 3 of practical nurse training, (15) and \$228,000 for vocational
 4 education in the fishery trades and industry including distribu-
 5 tive occupations therein, (16) ~~\$33,442,081~~ \$33,750,081:
 6 *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under section
 7 3 (a), (1), (2), (3), and (4) of the Vocational Education
 8 Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed
 9 \$29,267,081 for the current fiscal year (17): *Provided fur-*
 10 *ther*, That the amount of allotment which States and Terri-
 11 tories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among
 12 other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the
 13 programs for which the funds were originally apportioned.

14 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
 15 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section
 16 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C.
 17 329), \$2,501,500.

18 Grants for library services: For grants to the States
 19 pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1956, as amended (70 Stat.
 20 293-296, 911), \$5,000,000 (18): *Provided*, That the amount
 21 of any State's allotment from this appropriation which such
 22 State certifies will remain unpaid to it on June 30, 1959,
 23 may be reallocated by the Commissioner among other States
 24 applying therefor in proportion to their rural population,

1 *and deemed part of such allotments, except that no State's*
2 *allotment shall be so increased as to exceed the allotment*
3 *which would be made to it were this appropriation equal*
4 *to the maximum authorized under such Act.*

5 Payments to school districts: For payments to local edu-
6 cational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
7 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as
8 amended (20 U. S. C. ch. 13; 70 Stat. 909, 970-972),
9 \$127,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also
10 be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of
11 such Act.

12 Assistance for school construction: For an additional
13 amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local
14 educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized
15 by title III and title IV of the Act of September 23, 1950,
16 as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14; 70 Stat. 909, 968-969),
17 including not to exceed \$700,000 for necessary expenses of
18 technical services rendered by other agencies and not to
19 exceed \$5,000,000 for title IV, \$41,700,000, to remain
20 available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That no part of
21 this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other
22 direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and
23 Welfare.

24 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the

1 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations,
2 and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of
3 public and school library service; coordination of library
4 service on the national level with other forms of adult educa-
5 tion; developing library participation in Federal projects;
6 fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among
7 libraries, interstate library coordination and the development
8 of library service throughout the country; purchase, distri-
9 bution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
10 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
11 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
12 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
13 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
14 and repairing the same; and cooperative research, surveys,
15 and demonstrations in education as authorized by the Act of
16 July 26, 1954 (20 U. S. C. 331-332) ; \$7,000,000, of
17 which not less than \$550,000 shall be available for the
18 Division of Vocational Education as authorized.

19 **(19)***President's Committee on Education Beyond the High*
20 *School: For salaries and expenses for the President's Com-*
21 *mittee on Education Beyond the High School, including serv-*
22 *ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946*
23 *(5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings,*
24 *\$200,000.*

1 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

2 Grants to States and other agencies: For grants to
3 States and other agencies in accordance with the Voca-
4 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$45,100,000, of which
5 \$40,000,000 is for vocational rehabilitation services under
6 section 2 of said Act; \$1,500,000 is for extension and im-
7 provement projects under section 3 of said Act; and
8 \$3,600,000 is for special projects under section 4 of said
9 Act: *Provided*, That allotments under section 2 of said Act
10 to the States for the current fiscal year shall be made on
11 the basis of \$53,000,000, and this amount shall be con-
12 sidered the sum available for allotments under such section
13 for such fiscal year.

14 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
15 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, grants to States
16 under sections 2 and 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,
17 as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding
18 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
19 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged
20 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*,
21 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall
22 not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter
23 of the current fiscal year.

24 Training and traineeships: For training and traineeships
25 pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act,

1 as amended, and for carrying out the training functions
2 provided for in section 7 of said Act, \$4,400,000.

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carry-
4 ing out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act;
5 as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20
6 U. S. C., ch. 6A), as amended, \$1,330,000.

7 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

8 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
9 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A):
10 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, in-
11 cluding expenses for active commissioned officers in the
12 Reserve Corps and for not to exceed one thousand six
13 hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps;
14 and except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September
15 30, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 236-244), for expenses of primary
16 and secondary schooling of dependents of Public Health
17 Service personnel stationed in foreign countries, in amounts
18 not to exceed an average of \$250 per student, when it is
19 determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, avail-
20 able in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the
21 education of such dependents, and for the transportation
22 of such dependents between such schools and their places
23 of residence when the schools are not accessible to such
24 dependents by regular means of transportation; and for

1 the payment of compensation to consultants or individual
2 scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to
3 section 207 (e) or section 207 (f) of the Act at rates
4 established by the Surgeon General not to exceed \$15,000
5 per annum; as follows:

6 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
7 not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c)
8 of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pur-
9 suant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations
10 and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; to
11 provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity,
12 and vital statistics; to provide traineeships pursuant to sec-
13 tion 306 of the Act; and not to exceed \$1,000 for enter-
14 tainment of officials of other countries when specifically
15 authorized by the Surgeon General; ~~(20)\$19,592,000~~
16 ~~\$22,592,000~~.

17 Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska: To en-
18 able the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to
19 cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the con-
20 duct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention,
21 treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and
22 maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to
23 and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314
24 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f),
25 (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c)

1 of such section), 361, 363, and 371 of the Act, including
2 the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the
3 purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings,
4 \$2,165,000.

5 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
6 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
7 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
8 diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal
9 diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equip-
10 ment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act,
11 and with the approval of the respective State health author-
12 ities, to counties, health districts, and other political sub-
13 divisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
14 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
15 General may determine; \$4,415,000.

16 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
17 (b) of the Act, \$7,000,000, of which not less than
18 \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States,
19 to be matched by an equal amount of State and local
20 funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of
21 prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees,
22 and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and
23 case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used
24 directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but ex-
25 cluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria.

1 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
 2 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and
 3 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
 4 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate
 5 transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
 6 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire,
 7 maintenance, and operation of aircraft; ~~(21)~~\$6,200,000
 8 \$6,250,000.

9 Sanitary engineering activities: For expenses, not other-
 10 wise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of
 11 sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the Act relating
 12 to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, in-
 13 cluding enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and inter-
 14 state quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the pur-
 15 poses of the Acts of July 14, 1955 (Public Law 159), and
 16 July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), including \$2,700,000 for
 17 grants to States and \$300,000 for grants to interstate agen-
 18 cies; and the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft;
 19 \$12,640,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958.
 20 ~~(22)~~Grants for waste treatment works construction: For
 21 payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control
 22 Act, as amended, \$50,000,000, to remain available only
 23 until June 30, 1959.

24 Grants for waste treatment works construction: For
 25 payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control

1 *Act, as amended (70 Stat. 502), \$45,000,000 which to-*
2 *gether with the amount appropriated under this head in the*
3 *Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat.*
4 *769) shall be applied to payment on account of allotments*
5 *made for the current and preceding fiscal years pursuant to*
6 *said Act, such sums to remain available only until June*
7 *30, 1959: Provided, That allotments under such section 6*
8 *for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of*
9 *\$50,000,000.*

10 Grants for hospital construction: For payments under
11 parts C and G, title VI, of the Act, as amended, \$121,-
12 200,000, of which \$99,000,000 shall be for payments for
13 hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,200,-
14 000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636 of
15 the Act, and \$21,000,000 shall be for payments for facili-
16 ties pursuant to part G, as follows: \$6,500,000 for diag-
17 nostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the
18 chronically ill and impaired, \$4,000,000 for rehabilitation
19 facilities, and \$4,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided, That*
20 *allotments under such parts C and G to the several States*
21 *for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of*
22 *amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.*

23 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
24 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
25 of the Act, as amended, \$1,450,000.

1 **(23)** *Surveys and planning for hospital construction: The*
 2 *funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Ap-*
 3 *propriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 810) shall remain available*
 4 *for expenditure until June 30, 1959.*

5 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
 6 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August
 7 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), **(24)** *including \$1,186,000 to be*
 8 *available only for payments for medical care of dependents*
 9 *and retired personnel* under the Dependents' Medical Care
 10 Act (70 Stat. 250-254), and under sections 307, 321,
 11 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and
 12 810 of the Public Health Service Act, Private Law 419
 13 of the Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and Executive
 14 Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and
 15 exchange of farm products and livestock; conducting research
 16 on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative
 17 nursing services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition;
 18 \$44,399,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively avail-
 19 able for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and
 20 treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided, That*
 21 *when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a*
 22 *health service program for any department or agency, pay-*
 23 *ment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for*
 24 *deposit to the credit of this appropriation.*

25 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-

1 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to prevent-
 2 ing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign
 3 countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance
 4 with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
 5 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
 6 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of
 7 the Public Health Service are not available, including in-
 8 surance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when
 9 required by law of such countries, \$3,876,000.

10 Indian health activities: For expenses necessary to enable
 11 the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of
 12 August 5, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 2001), including services as
 13 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 14 U. S. C. 55a) (including not to exceed \$10,000 for such
 15 services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals,
 16 when authorized by the Surgeon General) ; ~~(25)~~*purchase of*
 17 *not to exceed seventy-five passenger motor vehicles, of which*
 18 *fifty shall be for replacement only*; hire of passenger motor
 19 vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for
 20 telephone service in private residences in the field, when
 21 authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and
 22 the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public
 23 Health Service Act; ~~(26)~~~~\$40,000,000~~ \$42,500,000.

24 Construction of Indian health facilities: For construc-
 25 tion, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health

1 and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for per-
 2 sonnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings;
 3 acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable build-
 4 ings; and purchase of trailers; \$3,096,000, to remain avail-
 5 able until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That such expenditures
 6 may be made through the Department of the Interior at
 7 the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health,
 8 Education, and Welfare.

9 National Institutes of Health, general research and
 10 services: For the activities of the National Institutes of
 11 Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fel-
 12 lowships and grants for research projects ~~(27)~~*and training*
 13 *grants* pursuant to section 301 of the Act; regulation and
 14 preparation of biologic products, and conduct of research
 15 related thereto; ~~(28)~~*purchase of not to exceed eight passenger*
 16 *motor vehicles for replacement only*; not to exceed \$2,500
 17 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically ap-
 18 proved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary struc-
 19 tures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances
 20 for demonstrations and research; \$14,026,000.

21 ~~(29)~~*National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For*
 22 *the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient con-*
 23 *duct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which*
 24 *are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs*
 25 *of operation are not readily susceptible of distribution as*

1 charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established
2 the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such
3 amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health
4 may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of es-
5 timated costs among the various appropriations involved may
6 be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available
7 for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as
8 may be prescribed by said Director, including not to exceed
9 \$2,500 each fiscal year for entertainment of visiting scien-
10 tists when specifically approved by said Director, and for the
11 operation of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and
12 others at rates to be determined by said Director to be suffi-
13 cient to cover the cost of such operation and the proceeds
14 thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: Provided,
15 That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in
16 the fiscal year in which they are advanced: Provided further,
17 That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual
18 costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appro-
19 priations from which such funds are advanced.

20 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
21 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
22 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
23 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
24 State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit
25 institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of

1 cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations,
 2 and grants-in-aid; ~~(30)~~and to contract for supplies and serv-
 3 ices by negotiation, without regard to section ~~3709~~ of the Re-
 4 vised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy pro-
 5 gram; and to contract on a cost or other basis for supplies
 6 and services by negotiation, without regard to section 3709
 7 of the Revised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy
 8 program, including indemnification of contractors to the
 9 extent and subject to the limitations provided in title 10,
 10 United States Code, section 2354, except that approval and
 11 certification required thereby shall be by the Surgeon General;
 12 and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A,
 13 of the Act; ~~(31)~~~~\$46,902,000~~ \$58,543,000.

14 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
 15 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 304,
 16 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental
 17 diseases, ~~(32)~~~~\$35,217,000~~ \$39,421,000~~(33)~~, together with
 18 not to exceed \$4,573,000 of the unobligated balance of the
 19 fiscal year 1957 appropriation granted under this head.

20 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
 21 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act,
 22 ~~(34)~~~~\$33,436,000~~ \$38,784,000.

23 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
 24 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to

1 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
2 diseases and conditions, \$6,430,000.

3 Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses
4 necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
5 arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, ~~(35)\$17,885,~~
6 ~~000~~ \$23,548,000.

7 Allergy and infectious disease activities: For expenses,
8 not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the pur-
9 poses of the Act relating to allergy and infectious diseases,
10 \$17,400,000, of which \$150,000 shall be available for pay-
11 ment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and
12 operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

13 Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses nec-
14 essary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to
15 neurology and blindness, ~~(36)\$18,887,000~~ \$24,058,000.

16 Grants for construction of health research facilities: For
17 grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of
18 1956, \$30,000,000.

19 National Library of Medicine: For expenses, not other-
20 wise provided for, necessary to carry out the National
21 Library of Medicine Act (70 Stat. 960), \$1,450,000.

22 ~~(37)~~Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of
23 commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments
24 under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of

1 1953, such amount as may be required during the current
2 fiscal year.

3 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of
4 the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous ex-
5 penses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for
6 elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and
7 publications related to public health; and conducting
8 studies and demonstrations in public health methods;
9 \$5,100,000.

10 ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
12 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including cloth-
13 ing for patients, and cooperation with organizations or
14 individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes,
15 prevention and treatment of mental illness, ~~(38)\$3,000,000~~
16 \$3,085,800.

17 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
18 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
19 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prepara-
20 tion of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision
21 of construction, \$55,000, to remain available until June 30,
22 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be
23 transferred to the General Services Administration.

24 Construction, treatment and cafeteria building: For
25 expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifi-

1 cations for a treatment and cafeteria building at Saint
 2 Elizabeths Hospital, \$180,000, to remain available until
 3 June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may
 4 be transferred to General Services Administration.

5 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

6 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors
 7 Insurance: For necessary expenses, not more than
 8 \$130,000,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age
 9 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That such
 10 amounts as are required shall be available to pay the cost
 11 of necessary travel incident to medical examinations for
 12 verifying disabilities of individuals who file applications for
 13 disability determinations under title II of the Social Security
 14 Act, as amended.

15 Advances to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For
 16 making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, advances to
 17 States under section 221 (e) of the Social Security Act, as
 18 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
 19 year, such sums as may be necessary from the above author-
 20 ization may be expended from the Federal old-age and
 21 survivors insurance trust fund.

22 **(39)** *Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insur-*
 23 *ance: For an additional amount for "Construction, Bureau*
 24 *of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance" for construction of*
 25 *an office building and appurtenant facilities, including ac-*

1 quisition of land, \$5,710,000, to be derived from the Federal
 2 Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which, to-
 3 gether with sums heretofore appropriated for these purposes,
 4 shall establish a limitation of cost of \$31,080,000: Provided,
 5 That the established limit of cost may be exceeded or shall
 6 be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage increase
 7 or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating
 8 from October 1, 1956, as determined by the Administrator,
 9 General Services Administration, and the amount to be de-
 10 rived from the aforesaid trust fund shall be increased or
 11 decreased accordingly: Provided further, That the immedi-
 12 ately preceding proviso shall be effective only if a contract
 13 for construction is executed on or before December 1, 1957.

14 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
 15 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid
 16 to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled,
 17 as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social
 18 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV,
 19 X, and XIV), \$1,600,000,000, of which such amount as may
 20 be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the
 21 prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year(40):
 22 ~~Provided, That not more than \$104,000,000 of the amount~~
 23 ~~herein appropriated shall be used for expenses of State and~~
 24 ~~local administration: Provided further, That none of the~~
 25 ~~amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs~~

1 of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1,
2 1957.

3 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For
4 expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
5 \$1,900,000.

6 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
7 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
8 amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social
9 Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
10 including purchase of reports and material for the publica-
11 tions of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,
12 \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation
13 contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
14 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the
15 care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
16 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
17 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
18 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
19 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund,
20 so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*,
21 That any State plan which provides standards for professional
22 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
23 shall be approved.

24 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
25 grants to States for maternal and child-health services,

1 services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as
2 authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
3 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
4 \$41,500,000, of which \$15,000,000 shall be available for
5 services for crippled children, \$16,500,000 for maternal and
6 child-health services, and \$10,000,000 for child-welfare
7 services: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to
8 section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included
9 in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of
10 sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or
11 estimated to be expended by the State: *Provided further*,
12 That \$1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502
13 (b) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for
14 mentally retarded children.

15 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
16 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of
17 Social Security, \$300,000, together with not to exceed
18 \$240,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
19 survivors insurance trust fund.

20 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
21 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
22 States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, and section 705
23 of title VII, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as
24 amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal
25 year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations in-

1 curred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments
2 under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation
3 therefor for that fiscal year.

4 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
5 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
6 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in
7 the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
8 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to
9 a State plan approved under such title prior to or during
10 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect
11 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
12 such plan was submitted for approval.

13 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

14 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For ex-
15 penses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,800,000,
16 together with not to exceed \$260,000 to be transferred from
17 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

18 Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration:
19 For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Administration,
20 \$2,300,000, together with not to exceed \$700,000 to be
21 transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
22 trust fund.

23 Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:
24 For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel,
25 \$500,000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 to be trans-

1 ferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certi-
 2 fication and inspection services", and not to exceed
 3 (41)\$425,000 \$449,000 to be transferred from the Federal
 4 old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

5 Surplus property utilization: For expenses necessary for
 6 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j), (k), (n),
 7 and (o), of the Federal Property and Administrative Serv-
 8 ices Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real
 9 and personal excess property for educational purposes and
 10 protection of public health, \$502,000.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
 13 salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in
 14 advance for dues or fees for library membership in organ-
 15 izations whose publications are available to members only
 16 or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

17 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
 18 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
 19 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
 20 (5 U. S. C. 55a) .

21 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for
 22 salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses
 23 and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with

1 the functions or activities for which such appropriations are
2 made.

3 SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for
4 salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or
5 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
6 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131).

7 SEC. 206. None of the funds appropriated by this title
8 to the Social Security Administration for grants-in-aid of
9 State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
10 operation of said agencies, including the salaries and ex-
11 penses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be
12 withheld from the said agencies of any States which have
13 established by legislative enactment and have in operation
14 a merit system and classification and compensation plan
15 covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation
16 of their employees, because of any disapproval of their per-
17 sonnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of
18 the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or
19 employees.

20 SEC. 207. The Secretary is authorized to make such
21 transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices,
22 without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying
23 out the operations of the Department.

1 ~~(42)~~SEC. 208. None of the funds provided herein shall be
 2 used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a
 3 research project an amount for indirect expenses in con-
 4 nection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of
 5 the direct costs.

6 SEC. ~~(43)~~209 208. None of the obligational authority
 7 available to the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-
 8 fare for planning and/or construction of buildings shall re-
 9 main available after June 30, 1959~~(44)~~: *Provided, That*
 10 *existing obligational authority to the Department of Health,*
 11 *Education, and Welfare for preparation of plans and speci-*
 12 *fications for the construction of the general office and the*
 13 *dental research buildings of the National Institutes of Health,*
 14 *and the National Library of Medicine building of the Public*
 15 *Health Service, shall remain available until June 30, 1958.*

16 SEC. ~~(45)~~210 209. None of the funds provided herein
 17 shall be used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or
 18 planning of any building for the Department of Health, Edu-
 19 cation, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor
 20 shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the
 21 salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone
 22 in connection with the construction or planning of any
 23 building for the Department of Health, Education, and
 24 Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

25 ~~(46)~~SEC. 210. *To the extent and under the conditions pro-*

1 *vided by regulations of the Secretary, officers (including*
2 *commissioned officers of the Public Health Service) and em-*
3 *ployees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*
4 *may hereafter, in connection with their attendance at meet-*
5 *ings or in performing advisory services concerned with the*
6 *functions or activities of the Department, be permitted to*
7 *accept payment, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal agen-*
8 *cies, organizations, and individuals, for travel and subsistence*
9 *expenses, to be retained by them to cover the cost thereof or*
10 *deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost*
11 *thereof is paid, as may be provided in such regulations.*

12 This title may be cited as the “Department of Health,
13 Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958”.

14 **TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS**

15 **BOARD**

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
18 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
19 (29 U. S. C. 141–167), and other laws, including expenses
20 of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the
21 Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the
22 General Counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of
23 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and uniforms,
24 or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of Sep-
25 tember 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131) ;

1 \$9,384,800: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
2 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agri-
3 cultural laborers or used in connection with investiga-
4 tions, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining
5 units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in
6 section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U. S. C.
7 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations
8 Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of
9 June 25, 1938 (29 U. S. C. 203), and including in said
10 definition employees engaged in the maintenance and opera-
11 tion of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when
12 maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at
13 least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby
14 is used for farming purposes.

15 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
18 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
19 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$520,000.

20 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses neces-
21 sary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the
22 Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and
23 emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to

1 section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160) , including steno-
2 graphic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the
3 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) , \$250,000.

4 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
6 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
7 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
8 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) , \$525,000, of which not
9 less than \$155,000 shall be available for compensation (at
10 rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees
11 appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act,
12 as amended.

13 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

14 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
15 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
16 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
17 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board,
18 when specifically authorized by the Board; stenographic
19 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
20 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and uniforms or allow-
21 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,
22 1954 (68 Stat. 1114) ; \$8,150,000, to be derived from the
23 railroad retirement account.

1 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
2 CONCILIATION SERVICE

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
4 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
5 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,
6 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
7 as provided in section 205 of said Act; expenses of boards of
8 inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206
9 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, concil-
10 iators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess
11 of \$75 per diem; ~~(47)~~*Government listed telephones in private*
12 *residences and private apartments for official use in cities*
13 *where mediators are officially stationed, but no Federal*
14 *mediation and conciliation service office is maintained;*
15 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement
16 only at not to exceed \$3,000; expenses of attendance at
17 meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and
18 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
19 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,550,000.

20 TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE
21 POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

22 Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac
23 River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to

1 pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac
2 River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses
3 of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the
4 administration of its business in the conservancy district
5 established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat.
6 748), \$5,000.

7 TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

8 For maintenance and operation of the United States Sol-
9 diers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent
10 fund, \$4,750,000, of which \$34,000 shall remain available
11 until June 30, 1959 for construction of buildings and facili-
12 ties, including demolition: *Provided*, That this appropriation
13 shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of
14 members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at
15 rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the
16 Army, upon the recommendation of the Board of Commis-
17 sioners of the Home and the Surgeon General of the Army.

18 TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

19 SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this
20 Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not
21 authorized by the Congress.

22 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor,

1 and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act,
2 1958.”

Passed the House of Representatives April 4, 1957.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 12, 1957.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 12, 1957

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

passed within a few hours, to be followed by general discussion on the mutual security authorization bill but without votes on that bill today. Minority views are to be filed tonight, and I do not wish to have action on the bill until copies of the minority views are available to Senators.

Mr. POTTER. Will there be a vote on the mutual security bill tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know when there will be a vote on it. There will be general discussion this afternoon. Probably several amendments will be offered. Just when a vote will be reached, I am unable to tell this far in advance. I have set aside Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday for consideration of that bill. I hope we shall be able to dispose of it by late Saturday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, according to the announcement of the majority leader, he hopes to take up the mutual security bill today. I have no objection to taking up the mutual security bill today based upon any parliamentary point, because of any pending minority views. The RECORD is clear that I have until 5 o'clock this evening to file minority views. I finished dictating them 30 minutes ago, and they will be on the desks of Senators tomorrow.

My understanding is that during the course of the discussion today the majority will begin the presentation of their point of view on the mutual security authorization bill, but that no votes will be taken upon any amendment to it. The minority views are based upon a proposal involving the submission of an entire series of amendments which would save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars which, in the opinion of the minority, are now being inexcusably wasted.

PRINTING OF INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR MORSE ON MUTUAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that it is necessary for me to ask unanimous consent to file my minority views on the mutual security bill by 5 o'clock this afternoon. The record is as follows:

There was a colloquy the other day, when we announced from the Committee on Foreign Relations that the bill had been favorably reported by the committee, and that the minority views would be filed by 5 o'clock today. Apparently at that time a request should have been made for permission to file them by 5 o'clock today. I now ask unanimous consent that I may be authorized to file my minority views and the supplementary views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] by 5 o'clock this afternoon, with the understanding that they will be printed overnight and placed on Senators' desks tomorrow morning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has stated the situation correctly. It was certainly understood in the Committee on Foreign Relations that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon would have an opportunity to file his views by 5 o'clock today. The legislative

history is clear on that point. If a technicality was not complied with, the Senator certainly should be entitled to have the permission to comply with it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that the distinguished minority leader has once more demonstrated the many courtesies he has extended to me in the 13 years I have been a Member of the Senate. I appreciate his attitude very much.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to read the views prepared by the Senator from Oregon. I thought that perhaps I should like to associate myself with the statements in the Senator's minority views. However, the Senator from Oregon believes, since he feels so strongly on this matter, the views should be personal to him.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comment. He will see my statement before it is filed, as will the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. However, because of the position I took in committee with respect to certain legal aspects in connection with the matter under discussion, I would not wish to ask my colleagues to associate themselves with my point of view, but, rather, speak only for myself. I state in my minority views that I share the views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], that the bill should be drastically cut in many particulars. The Senator from Louisiana will have an opportunity to read my views, although my position in the committee was somewhat different from the position the Senator from Louisiana took in respect to some of the reasons for dissenting. I do not think it would be fair to the Senator to ask him to join in my minority views. I have taken it for granted that the Senator from Louisiana, by his expression of his own personal minority views, will make his position very clear on this issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I shall read the Senator's statement with a great deal of interest. I am particularly concerned about some phases of the program as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am particularly concerned about the so-called revolving fund, which removes all the economic aid from any real congressional control, by setting up a permanent fund, over which Congress will have, at best, very limited control.

I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon approves of that particular phase of the bill. Some of us, who are concerned about it, will have an opportunity to vote to retain in the Congress of the United States some measure of control over the program. A number of other items in the bill disturb me also.

I shall look forward eagerly to the Senator's amendments, in the hope that some of them will be along the line of my thinking, so that I may support the effort to make the program more realistic.

Mr. MORSE. It was not my intention, in making my unanimous-consent request, to open debate on the mutual-security bill. I do not think it would be courteous to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for me to do so.

I wish to say very quickly in passing, to my good friend from Georgia, that I am not at all surprised, inasmuch as he is such a great constitutional lawyer, that he should make the observations he has made. I wish to assure him that one section of my minority views is given over to the constitutional question, and to what I consider to be an abdication by Congress of its legislative duties under the Constitution.

Having served with the Senator from Georgia for a number of years on the Committee on Armed Services, and although there may have been some times when we voted differently, I cannot recall when we ever voted differently on any major item before the committee, and, in fact, I cannot recall any minor one, for that matter, when we voted differently; I should like to say to him that I also take the position in my minority views that tremendous savings can be made in the military budget. It should no longer be considered a sacred cow, but should be put on the legislative operating table of Congress in order that we may cut out some of its cancers.

I press my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1957— MINORITY AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Subsequently, Mr. MORSE, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted his minority views, together with the supplemental views of Mr. LONG, on the bill (S. 2130) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, heretofore reported by Mr. GREEN from that committee which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 417.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WEL- FARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be on notice, I ask unanimous consent that on the question of the passage of the pending measure, the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments appropriation bill, the yeas and nays be ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill under consideration provides an appropriation of \$2,885,290,781 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education,

and Welfare. This amount is an increase of \$38,459,200 over the House bill, but is under the budget estimates for 1958 by \$96,636,800.

The committee has approved a total of \$354,348,600 for the Department of Labor, an increase of \$5,288,400 over the House bill. Included in the committee's recommendation are items totaling \$321,800,000, or 90.81 percent of the budget estimates, for which funds must be provided. Included are grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, \$260 million, paid out of the earmarked Federal unemployment tax revenues; in other words, that amount comes out of revenues raised by special taxes and does not come out of the Federal Treasury.

For unemployment compensation for veterans, the bill provides \$36,800,000.

For unemployment compensation for Federal employees, \$25 million is included.

For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the committee recommends a total of \$2,516,707,381. Included in the recommendations are items totaling \$1,768,700,000, representing 70.27 percent of the Department's estimates, for which funds must be provided for grants to States for public assistance, \$1,600,000,000; for payments to school districts, \$127 million; and for assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, \$41,700,000. The basic legislation for these three programs definitely commits the Congress to provide whatever funds are required.

Not included in the above category, but certainly programs which permit little or no reduction from the budget estimates, are those for grants to States for maternal and child welfare; for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation; for grants to States for hospital construction; for grants to States for waste treatment works construction; and for assistance to States for local public health units. These together with the items for public assistance and school construction and school maintenance and operation total in excess of \$2 billion.

The increases recommended throughout the bill are at a minimum when consideration is given to the fact that this bill was under consideration by the House for 10 days, with extensive amendments offered on the floor of the House and numerous reductions made in the amounts recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations, following extended, detailed, and exhaustive hearings, during which the bill was thoroughly examined and considered. Senators will recall that on the day of passage of the bill in the House there were 14 yea-and-nay votes.

Increases recommended by our committee for the Department of Labor only partially restore the reductions effected by floor amendments under the House committee recommendations. For one item—the Mexican farm labor program—we recommend the same amount as the House committee allowance.

The substantial increases approved by our committee are for medical research in the killing and crippling diseases—cancer, heart disease, mental ill-

nesses, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, neurological disorders, and blindness. For each of these items the committee recommends increases in excess of the budget estimates. In total, we have approved increases of \$32,027,000 for the National Institutes of Health for use in the fight against killing diseases.

Last year our committee reported to the Senate a bill containing amendments for increases in these same items amounting to \$56,282,000 over the budget estimates, or 44.48 percent over the amounts requested.

This year's recommendation of increases, totaling \$32,027,000, amounts to 16.84 percent over the amounts requested.

It is recalled that there were doubts expressed last year as to whether the funds recommended by the committee last year would be wisely and prudently spent and whether there was available manpower to carry on the additional research possible with the greatly increased funds. The Senate committee considered the matter very thoroughly, and the position of the Senate committee was fully vindicated. Manpower was available, and the funds have been wisely and prudently expended.

Mr. President, following the usual procedure, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, and that the bill as amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, with this exception:

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has called attention to the language on page 30, line 18:

Provided, That the Chief and Assistant Chief of the Training and Standards Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health shall each be compensated at a salary rate not to exceed \$17,500 per annum.

The committee included this proviso in the bill, conscious of the fact that more than half of the hospital beds in the United States today are occupied by patients suffering from mental illness, and that the cost of mental illness runs into billions of dollars each year.

The Senator from South Carolina has called attention to this proviso, and I have consulted with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and formerly was the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

So in asking unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be agreed to en bloc, we do not ask unanimous consent that the proviso beginning on line 18, page 30, and ending on line 22, which I have just read, be included. That means, then, that the proviso will be stricken from the bill.

The Senator from South Carolina has advised me that he and his committee are giving their thought, attention, and consideration to this very matter now; they are examining into the question at this very time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Along that line, last year, if Senators will recall, approximately 800 of the super-

grade positions were acted upon. At present, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is holding hearings and is considering the matter. Even today, in order to conserve the time of the Senate, I am having lunch with the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to discuss with him matters pertaining to the various grades, such as the one concerned in this instance. The committee will then look into the matter.

As I understand, the provision beginning on line 18 and ending on line 22, of page 30, will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that the salary range of \$17,500 for this particular position would be proper. I regret that it is found to be necessary to strike the provision from the bill. But with the assurance that the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the committee having jurisdiction of the question of salaries and qualifications, and all other matters relating to the civil service, will take the matter under consideration and will include it in a study to make certain that the salary range will be adjusted as it should be adjusted, I shall not object to the striking of the provision. But in the committee the decision was made to report the bill to the Senate with this provision included.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Inasmuch as the committee had already included the provision in the bill, I wish to state that we shall give the matter special treatment. But the Senator from Minnesota, who served for so many years on the committee of which I am chairman, knows what we have to do in the case of placing certain employees in the super grades under the Classification Act. In that connection there are many headaches, because when one case of that sort comes up, other employees wish to be treated similarly.

Mr. THYE. I appreciate that. If I had remained on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I would now be its senior Republican member. However, I had long endeavored to obtain a seat on the Appropriations Committee; and a number of years ago I had to decide whether I would leave the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in order to become a member of the Appropriations Committee. I regretted leaving the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because of the excellent work it does on matters relating to the classification of employees.

Let me say that the Senator from South Carolina is doing an excellent job as chairman of the committee, and I am confident that this particular position will have his personal attention. In all justice, the proposed increase in salary should be made.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind remarks concerning me. During the many years he and I served together on the committee,

everything was very, very pleasant; and he did excellent work there. At that time we worked together both on subcommittees and on the full committee. His work was excellent, and I know he is doing equally fine work at present on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, let me inquire whether the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare has completed his statement on the bill.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

At this time I wish to join in what the senior Senator from Minnesota has said, namely, that the salary in this case certainly should be \$17,500. I know how able and devoted is the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and it is gratifying to have him tell us now that the matter will receive his particular attention, and that, in fact, he is already giving it his best attention. I wish to thank the Senator for what he is doing in regard to this item, because the salary in this particular case really should be \$17,500. So I thank my very able and distinguish friend, the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for his remarks about me, and also for what he has said about this particular item.

I wish to say that I have examined this appropriation bill, and it shows a great deal of study. The Senator from Alabama has done an excellent job on the bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. We have a very hard-working subcommittee, and the bill as reported represents the teamwork of all of us. We particularly appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has done in connection with bringing the bill before the Senate.

Mr. President, following the precedent, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments, except for the proviso on page 30, in line 18, be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of these committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 11, after the figures "\$1,480,000", to strike out the comma and "of which not more than \$170,000 shall be for international labor affairs", and in line 13, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "Provided, That the limitation of \$154,490 for international labor affairs appearing in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 423) is increased to \$159,490."

Under the subhead "Office of the Solicitor", on page 3, line 9, after the word "Solicitor", to strike out "\$2,021,000" and insert "\$2,191,000", and in the same line, after the amend-

ment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "together with not to exceed \$365,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Employment Security", on page 5, line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$5,558,000" and insert "\$6,000,000, of which \$5,874,400 shall be derived by transfer from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, and".

On page 6, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "\$249,814,000" and insert "\$260,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which \$10,000,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments."

On page 9, line 15, after the word "laws", to strike out "\$2,236,200" and insert "\$2,500,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 11, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$7,124,000" and insert "\$7,225,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Food and Drug Administration", on page 12, line 25, after "(21 U. S. C. 61-64)", to insert "including purchase of not to exceed 89 passenger motor vehicles of which 51 shall be for replacement only."

On page 13, line 22, after the word "equipment", to insert "purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

Under the subhead "Office of Education", on page 16, line 22, after "(20 U. S. C., ch. 2)", to insert a semicolon and "70 Stat. 1126"; on page 17, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "and section 9 of the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 909)"; in line 3, after the word "training" to insert "and \$228,000 for vocational education in the fishery trades and industry including distributive occupations there"; in line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$33,442,081" and insert "\$33,750,081", and in line 9, after the word "year", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

"Provided further, That the amount of allotment which States and Territories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned."

On page 17, line 20, after the figures "\$5,000,000" to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"Provided, That the amount of any State's allotment from this appropriation which such State certifies will remain unpaid to it on June 30, 1959, may be reallocated by the Commissioner among other States applying therefor in proportion to their rural population, and deemed part of such allotments, except that no State's allotment shall be so increased as to exceed the allotment which would be made to it were this appropriation equal to the maximum authorized under such act."

On page 19, after line 18, to insert:

"President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School: For salaries and expenses for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings, \$200,000."

Under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 22, line 15, after the word "General", to strike out "\$19,592,000" and insert "\$22,592,000."

On page 24, line 6, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$6,200,000" and insert "\$6,250,000."

On page 24, after line 18, to strike out:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$50,000,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1959."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (70 Stat. 502), \$45,000,000 which together with the amount appropriated under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 769) shall be applied to payment on account of allotments made for the current and preceding fiscal years pursuant to said act, such sums to remain available only until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That allotments under such section 6 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of \$50,000,000."

On page 25, after line 24, to insert:

"Surveys and planning for hospital construction: The funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 810) shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1959."

On page 26, line 6, after "(5 U. S. C. 150)", to insert "including \$1,186,000 to be available only for payments for medical care of dependents and retired personnel."

On page 27, line 15, after the word "General", to insert "purchase of not to exceed 75 passenger motor vehicles, of which 50 shall be for replacement only", and in line 22, after the word "act", to strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$42,500,000."

On page 28, line 11, after the word "projects" to insert "and training grants", and in line 14, after the word "thereto", to insert "purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

On page 28, after line 19, to insert:

"National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of operation are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of estimated costs among the various appropriations involved may be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Director, including not to exceed \$2,500 each fiscal year for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by said Director, and for the operation of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates to be determined by said Director to be sufficient to cover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in the fiscal year in which they are advanced: *Provided further*, That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appropriations from which such funds are advanced."

On page 30, line 1, after "grants-in-aid," to strike out "and to contract for supplies and services by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy program;" and insert "and to contract on a cost or other basis for supplies and services

by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy program, including indemnification of contractors to the extent and subject to the limitations provided in title 10, United States Code, section 2354, except that approval and certification required thereby shall be by the Surgeon General; and in line 12, after the word "act", to strike out "\$46,902,000" and insert "\$58,543,000."

On page 30, line 16, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$35,217,000" and insert "\$39,421,000, together with not to exceed \$4,573,000 of the unobligated balance of the fiscal year 1957 appropriation granted under this head."

On page 30, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "\$33,436,000" and insert "\$38,784,000."

On page 31, line 7, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$17,885,000" and insert "\$23,548,000."

On page 31, line 17, after the word "blindness", to strike out "\$18,887,000" and insert "\$24,058,000."

On page 31, after line 23, to insert:

"Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year."

Under the subhead "St. Elizabeths Hospital", on page 32, line 16, after the word "illness", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,085,800."

Under the subhead "Social Security Administration", on page 33, after line 22, to insert:

"Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For an additional amount for 'Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance' for construction of an office building and appurtenant facilities, including acquisition of land, \$5,710,000, to be derived from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which, together with sums heretofore appropriated for these purposes, shall establish a limitation of cost of \$31,080,000: *Provided*, That the established limit of cost may be exceeded or shall be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating from October 1, 1956, as determined by the Administrator, General Services Administration, and the amount to be derived from the aforesaid trust fund shall be increased or decreased accordingly: *Provided further*, That the immediately preceding proviso shall be effective only if a contract for construction is executed on or before December 1, 1957."

On page 34, line 22, after the word "year", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*", That not more than \$104,000,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be used for expenses of State and local administration: *Provided further*, That none of the amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1, 1957."

Under the subhead "Office of the Secretary", on page 38, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$425,000" and insert "\$449,000."

Under the heading "General Provisions," on page 39, after line 23, to strike out:

"Sec. 208. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 percent of the direct costs."

On page 40, line 8, after the numerals "1959", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That existing obligational authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for preparation of plans

and specifications for the construction of the general office and the dental research buildings of the National Institutes of Health, and the National Library of Medicine building of the Public Health Service, shall remain available until June 30, 1958."

On page 40, after line 23, to insert:

"Sec. 211. To the extent and under the conditions provided by regulations of the Secretary, officers (including commissioned officers of the Public Health Service) and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may hereafter, in connection with their attendance at meetings or in performing advisory services concerned with the functions or activities of the Department, be permitted to accept payment, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal agencies, organizations, and individuals, for travel and subsistence expenses, to be retained by them to cover the cost thereof or deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost thereof is paid, as may be provided in such regulations."

Under the heading "Title VI—Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service," on page 44, line 6, after the words "per diem", to insert a semicolon and "Government listed telephones in private residences and private apartments for official use in cities where mediators are officially stationed, but no Federal mediation and conciliation service office is maintained."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to join the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in commenting on this particular appropriation bill.

The only appreciable increase in the appropriation items included in the bill as reported to the Senate, over those included in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, is in the items for the National Institutes of Health, in the fields of cancer research, mental health, heart disease, dental health, and other diseases. We felt completely justified in following the recommendations of the National Association on Health in the case of these items, because the history of this matter has been that when funds could properly be used and when the necessary facilities, research workers, scientists were available, the funds were allocated and were made available for continued research; but that if the necessary facilities, research workers, technicians and scientists, were not available the funds have not been allocated. So we felt perfectly justified in recommending these increases in the items.

Otherwise, the bill is very much the same as it was when it was passed by the House of Representatives.

I wish to say that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], held extensive hearings; and in a most searching manner he proceeded to obtain information regarding every item, whether in the field of health, education, and welfare, or in the field of labor.

In my opinion the bill as reported is an excellent one in the case of every item. Most certainly the Senator from Alabama has done a splendid job in getting the bill into such shape that all Members of the Senate are able to understand what it contains. I hope it can be passed without further amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota has been a member of the subcommittee handling the bill longer than any other member of the subcommittee. He has been a most devoted member of the subcommittee, and formerly he was its distinguished chairman. Certainly he knows about all the items and provisions of the bill, and he has contributed very greatly to the work of the subcommittee and to the writing of the amendments to the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee who attended as many hearings as possible, I wish especially to commend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for the very fine attention they gave to the vast number of subject matters included in the bill. They did so day after day, week after week, and month after month; in fact, their attention to these subject matters extends from one year to another, during every month of the year, I am sure.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, during the recesses of Congress there have been times when many of us who serve on the subcommittee have gone to various universities, colleges, and research centers, and have tried to acquaint ourselves with the work being done in the field of research. We have done that right at the laboratories, where the scientists have demonstrated what they were actually accomplishing by means of the research funds which had been made available. That interest on our part has not only carried us into the field, so as to become acquainted with the work being done by the scientists, but it has also kept us in close contact with those who work in these fields.

In its report the committee has stated what has been done to expand the research facilities, as well as to encourage the best of our youth to engage in such research work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for that information. Mr. President, if I may have the floor—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me further say that of the many subjects on which the subcommittee, led by those whose names I have mentioned, has passed on, I think none is more important than the health program, to which they have given such fine attention. In this connection, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] should also be mentioned, because of her very fine knowledge of the subject matter, and her special attention to it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to join the Senator from Mississippi in the richly deserved tribute which he has paid to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. He is a Senator dedicated to his work, his State, and the Nation. He is most dedicated to those constructive activities that serve mankind.

I wish particularly to point out at this time the close attention which the subcommittee gave to the public-health program's operations at the State and county level, and which resulted in the increase voted by the subcommittee in that particular appropriation.

Mr. President, those programs operate, not through the public-health office alone of each State, but through the doctors, the nurses, the various patriotic organizations, the PTA's, and other groups and citizens generally.

If I may take a few minutes, I should like to read some of the remarkable accomplishments of this particular service in my State, led by an outstanding doctor, Felix J. Underwood. I asked him to send me these figures. I marvel so at what they show that I want to preserve them in the RECORD.

For instance, in Jasper County, Miss., in 1940, there were 345 recorded cases of malaria. In 1955, there were no cases of malaria.

In another county, in 1940, there were 150 such cases. In 1955, there were none.

In the same county, in 1940, there were 33 cases of pellagra. In 1950, there was not a single case of pellagra.

In the same county there were 254 cases of measles in 1940, and only 2 cases in 1955.

In another county, there were 94 cases of malaria in 1940, but there were no cases in 1955.

In still another county, there were 302 cases of malaria in 1940, but not a single case in 1955.

In another county, there were 21 deaths from malaria in 1925, but not a single death from such cause in 1955.

In that particular county, there were 24 deaths from pellagra in 1925. In 1955, there was not a single death from that disease.

The same comment could be made with respect to many of the other counties.

Those statistics illustrate the very fine and effective work the program has accomplished over the years, with a very small contribution by the Federal Government, and the expenses shared by the State and county governments. It represents an excellent illustration of cooperation and contribution at the three government levels, and most effective accomplishments as a result.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I happen to be familiar with the work Dr. Underwood has done. The Senator has spoken about cooperation between the Federal Government and the States. I am glad the Senator did so, because fine a doctor as Dr. Underwood is, he certainly had the whole-

hearted support and cooperation of the Senator from Mississippi, which was necessary. Unless Dr. Underwood had had the support which he received from the Senator from Mississippi, it would not have been possible for him to do the work he did. The Senator from Mississippi has been an outstanding leader in carrying forward this program, particularly in supporting the local county health units, as well as other great programs for the health of the American people.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Alabama. I am a latecomer in this field. I appreciate particularly what the Senator from Alabama has said about Dr. Underwood, who is an outstanding doctor, and one of the most consecrated men I have ever known.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has graciously allowed me to take the floor before him, because I have an engagement waiting for me to fill now.

I wish to make a few comments on this very important bill. I have had a great many people inquire as to the work of the committee. I think the committee, on balance and in total, has done a splendid job.

I had a great deal of experience with such measures in the House of Representatives when I served there, and I had the great honor of being the author of the national heart disease research program bill. So I am very familiar with the criterion which should be used in a judgment on this appropriation bill.

I might say, too, that no bill dealing with the National Institutes of Health, with regard to a program for health research, ought ever to be discussed in the Congress without mentioning the name of one of our colleagues in the House, Frank Keefe, of Wisconsin—a very conservative man, a very economy-minded man, who nevertheless got his teeth into the whole problem of Federal research into serious diseases and other medical problems, and carried his efforts through to fruition, and initiated, in the other body of Congress, appropriations which are now standard, as reflected in this appropriation bill.

With respect to specific matters, I should like to commend the committee very highly for recognizing one of the most important problems which face our institutions of higher learning, and for allowing, in spite of the fact that it was not allowed in the other body, \$200,000 for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. I hope very much, knowing the caliber of the men concerned, they will stand fast by that item in conference.

We have 1,400,000 boys and girls who are expected to graduate from high school this year. By 1965 the number will be in excess of 2 million. By 1970 it will be about 2,200,000. Yet we find that about 200,000 students who are of

college caliber have difficulty in trying to attend college for financial reasons; and about 100,000 in the gifted category, who could be leaders in sciences and professions, will not be able to attend college because of financial difficulties.

Such a situation cries aloud for action on a loan bill for college students, such as I have sponsored, or a so-called college bill, which has been sponsored by others. Such action certainly demands the greatest priority, even as an element—and I think this is writing it down considerably, but it still must be said—in the anti-Communist struggle. The Soviet Union graduates twice as many engineers as we do. It trains students from other countries—one of the most critical elements of foreign policy in which we could engage—to the number of about 250,000, while we train 36,000, which is a new high.

I commend the committee for some recognition of this problem and for giving consideration to the matter.

I think also the committee has done splendidly in giving attention to libraries and hospitals, particularly in rural areas, which are necessary to bring the cultural level of the country even higher than it is.

Moreover, the committee has done very well with respect to the matter of the organized trucking industry and the administration of the minimum-wage levels on Federal highway construction.

I should like to address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee upon one matter, and that relates to the provision contained in the bill for dental research. I think the committee is to be commended for its recognition of the critical contribution to health of dental research.

I should like to suggest to the chairman of the subcommittee that some reply should be given to the dental societies, especially the American Dental Society and the Dental Society of the State of New York, which feel that attention should have been given to the recommendation for an appropriation of \$3,700,000 for construction of a research building for a National Institution of Dental Research.

I might say to the chairman of the subcommittee that the reference made to that question is at page 854 of the hearings, relating to a preliminary appropriation for planning of the building.

I hasten to add that I am not in any way finding fault, but I feel that when such a great body of professional people express an interest, some reply ought to be given to them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from New York raised this question. I want him to know I feel just as he does, that that building should be constructed, and should be constructed at the earliest possible moment.

Let me say also that at the present time there is what we might call a freeze on construction, as the Senator perhaps realizes. The administration is not going forward with construction of new buildings at this time.

But the committee has provided for the continuation of the availability of some \$200,000, so that there will be no delay so far as preparing the plans for this building is concerned. In other words, the committee continues the availability of \$200,000, appropriated last year, so that the administration may go forward and make blueprints and plans for the building contemplated. As soon as the freeze is lifted and the administration is ready to proceed with new construction, we certainly hope we have the funds provided in a supplemental or deficiency bill.

As is the Senator from New York, the Senator from Alabama is most anxious and eager to see this construction under way, to see this building started, and to see it finished.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much, and I wish to commend him personally. I know how hard he has worked on this matter, and what a great contribution he has made to the cause of the American people, in this appropriation bill and otherwise. I would have expected the Senator to say what he has said. I feel the dental profession should be tremendously encouraged by the disposition shown by the chairman of the subcommittee. I thank him very much.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas with the understanding I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I much appreciate the courtesy of the very able Senator from Oregon for giving me this opportunity to pay tribute to two outstanding members of the committee, who have devoted so much time to preparing and bringing before the Senate not only the fine report submitted, but an outstanding appropriation bill, which I think deals fairly with health, education, and welfare.

I know that the three agencies could not have had more able Senators handling their appropriations, or, what I appreciate most, Senators who handled the matter with greater sympathy. I think they have rendered an outstanding service by their work on this bill.

I wish to mention one item in which I am particularly interested, namely, the mental health program. If I read the report correctly, an additional amount of \$8,777,000 was recommended for that program.

I have had some experience in dealing with mental health programs, and I appreciate the increase in the sum appropriated by the bill. I sincerely hope the House will approve the increase.

My State has been fortunate, in that it has had the privilege of using the Menninger Foundation, not only nationally known but internationally known, in establishing its mental health program. In cooperation with State health agencies and the medical profession, my State

adopted a mental health program in 1947.

I should like to report to the Senate that, in 1955, 75 percent of the people who were admitted to the State hospital for mental illness were released before the end of 12 months. That is an example of the experience we are having in our State. Mental illness can be cured. It can be treated at home.

The expansion in the program made possible by the increase recommended in the appropriation will, I think, mean much not only to the patients themselves, but to their friends, their families, to the State, and to the Nation.

To the very able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the ranking minority member, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Kansas wishes to say he is deeply indebted for the fine way in which they have handled this appropriation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for the kind and generous words he has spoken to the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Alabama.

I might say that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has been one of the most interested and effective members of the subcommittee. Particularly has he been helpful in the matter of the health appropriations.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that his State is recognized as the great pioneer State in the matter of mental health. The State of Kansas has done many things in that field. It has set an inspiring and challenging example for the other 47 States. The great program which the State of Kansas is now carrying forward was ably aided and abetted by the distinguished Senator when he was the governor of Kansas. The Senator from Kansas, while governor, had the vision to see the possibilities in the field of mental health, and, as governor, took the lead in launching the great programs which have done so much not only for the mentally ill in the State of Kansas, but, by setting this challenging example, have done so much for all the States and all the people of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for referring to the work of the subcommittee. I can say, Mr. President, that every member serving on the subcommittee has been diligent, although we have busy schedules, and oftentimes there would be more than two appropriation subcommittee meetings scheduled for hearings at the same time. There were times when it was almost mandatory on some of the Senators to attend other appropriation subcommittee sessions, or other legislative committee sessions, and therefore it was not possible for all the subcommittee members to be sitting at the same hearing.

However, on this particular subcommittee there serves the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER], who was present at a great number of the hearings, as well as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

I could proceed to name every one of the subcommittee members, each of whom devoted an enormous amount of personal time to study of the question of appropriations affecting health matters.

I should like to refer now to the work of the State of Kansas and of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] while he was Governor of the State, in the field of mental health.

I was Governor of Minnesota during the war years, when we were oftentimes denied the full complement of institutional employees necessary, because they were not available. We could not build. However, we had an interim committee which was studying the needs for institutional improvements, including what was necessary in building expansion, as well as program development.

Our State was fortunate to have as its next executive, Governor Youngdahl. He made a most outstanding record for treatment of mental health and the development of facilities for treatment of mental health.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is familiar with what was done in Minnesota, because he, as Governor of Kansas, was working in that field along with Governor Youngdahl, and they both were availing themselves of the enormous amount of research which the military was compelled to do in the mental-health field, because of the mental fatigue and mental breakdowns which occurred in the military services under the pressures of World War II.

So we have advanced far by reason of the assistance of Congress, and because of men like the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and Governor Youngdahl, who were serving as governors of their respective States. They were availing themselves of the knowledge which had been gained in the military mental health work. The people of the Nation are beginning to appreciate the work of the Senator from Kansas and Governor Youngdahl, now Judge Youngdahl, as well as the work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has served as chairman of this subcommittee and has done such constructive work in the committee and in the Congress.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me another minute?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I regret to trespass on the time of the Senator from Oregon, who has been so generous, but I cannot let this opportunity pass without stating that I did not intend to omit the name of any member of the Appropriations Subcommittee. I did not start by naming the individual members, because I could not recall all the names. Every member has worked diligently, and has done an outstanding piece of work in

bringing forth this appropriation bill. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] have performed a great service.

With regard to the mental health work in Kansas, let me say, in no spirit of egotism, that in all my public service I gained more satisfaction from the mental health program which was started in my State in 1947 than from any other phase of my activities. It was not the Governor of Kansas who did it. The people of Kansas did it. At one time, we were ranked 47th in the list of States in the field of mental health. Today we are third among the States of the Union, and our record is outstanding in obtaining results. It is a great satisfaction to know that in Kansas when people are committed to a mental institution, 75 percent of them are returned home well and cured within a year. That is the record within my State.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I visited the Senate of the United States when I was governor of my State 7 or 8 years ago. I shall always remember that the very first personality to whom I was introduced on the floor of the Senate was the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If my memory serves me correctly, he was the party whip at that time.

I need not tell his colleagues, who know him possibly better than I do, that that friendship has grown over the years. He left an impression with me on that day which will remain with me always.

It has been my pleasure to serve as a member of the subcommittee. It is one of the most exhilarating, satisfying, and proudest association I have had in my service in the Senate.

I believe that LISTER HILL is one of the great personalities in this body. He is a great humanitarian. He loves his fellow men. I think he exemplifies the eternal commandment to love one's neighbor as oneself. LISTER HILL deserves a great deal of credit for the fine job he has done as a member of the subcommittee. The people of the Nation are fortunate to have a man of his caliber and quality as chairman of the subcommittee, and I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding in order that I, too, may pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this appropriation bill.

It has been my privilege to serve on that subcommittee ever since I became a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am constantly amazed at the knowledge of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with respect to all phases of the agencies whose appropriations are considered by the subcommittee, particularly as they relate to health matters. He brings to the subcommittee not only profound knowledge, but sympathetic

understanding. I assure Senators that that spirit radiates to the other members of the committee, by reason of his leadership.

I again commend the chairman for a masterful presentation. I know, from the work which has already been done in the field of research in the great institutes of health, that thousands of lives have been saved as a result of such research. We should be impressed when we stop to realize the areas we are about to break through in the field of medical research, and the great potentialities for safeguarding the lives of the people of this country. Only a small amount of money is appropriated for these purposes, as compared with the amount appropriated for research in the military field, whether it be in connection with aircraft, or any other feature of military endeavor.

This research program costs probably less than the research on a bomber. Nevertheless, this is a program which saves and preserves the lives of American citizens, rather than being used for destructive purposes.

Once again I wish to express my great admiration for the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his most kind and generous words. I repeat what I said a few minutes ago, that it was teamwork which brought this bill to the floor.

Mr. POTTER. The team needed a good captain, however.

Mr. HILL. No member of the team was more faithful and devoted than the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and no one contributed more than he did.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish also to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the fine work he has done in the preparation of this bill and bringing it before the Senate.

I note that in some instances there have been increases over the amounts allowed by the House. I am particularly happy that there were increases in the fields in which they were made, dealing primarily with health research, and the effort to find a cure for cancer, for various heart diseases, allergies, arthritis, metabolic diseases, and various other ailments, also neurological studies, studies in the field of blindness, and other activities.

Someday we shall find the cure for most of these causes of human suffering and early death. It is unfortunate that in many instances the cure will be found much too late to benefit those who are living today. However, many people will be benefited, and many will live better lives and longer lives because of the additional funds being provided by this bill to carry forward the program of health research. I know of no expenditure which could be made by the

Government which would pay greater dividends than the funds expended in health research.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] was one of those who first recognized the great need in this field. He has fought diligently in behalf of health research. The bill provides less money than he would like to see available for these purposes, but I suppose it is as much as could be provided at this time to go forward with the program.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for seeing to it that at least the items in the field of health research did not suffer in the process of reducing governmental expenditures.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his kind and generous words. We have made definite progress in the field of the diseases to which the Senator refers, but there is much yet to be done. Every 2 minutes during which we have been considering this bill, a man, woman, or child in this country has died from cancer. More people die each year from diseases of the heart and circulatory system than from all other causes combined.

More than 50 percent of the hospital beds of the country today are occupied by people suffering from some form of mental illness. We have made progress, but the battle must continue. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has so well said, we must stand dedicated to winning this battle over crippling and killing diseases.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In line with what the Senator from Alabama has said, I would be the first to agree that there are a great number of places in the budget where worthwhile economies can and should be made. But certainly the items which have been increased are items which should be increased. The program should be expanded.

I hope the Senator from Alabama will be successful in maintaining these items when he goes to conference with Members of the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues who are not members of the subcommittee in expressing appreciation for the excellent work which has been done on the appropriation bill before the Senate, not only by the members of the subcommittee, but by its great chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I doubt if any other man in the past decade has done so much for so many in attempting to eradicate or eliminate or reduce human suffering from every phase of American life and in establishing health facilities and great research projects in cancer and other diseases which have afflicted mankind for generations, and in bringing about appropriations commensurate with the importance of such projects in the national picture.

We can feel that America is a much better place because the Senator from

Alabama has been able to guide, with the fine ability he has, the development of this great research program in medicine.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I feel certain that Senator HILL knows my particular interest in the urgent subject we are discussing today. It is a marvelous tribute to the Senator from Alabama that the funds have been increased over the budget estimate and over the House allowances for the various vital aspects of the National Institutes of Health, such as the National Cancer Institute, the Institute of Mental Health, the National Heart Institute, and related activities.

I doubt if any Senator, no matter how eloquent he might be, could say anything on the floor of the Senate today that would add to the encomiums which have come so deservedly to the Senator from Alabama.

However, I should like to presume on the time of the Senate to refer to a tribute to LISTER HILL that I heard from another man who is far better equipped than any Senator could possibly be to tell of the good deeds and the marvelous work of the Senator from Alabama in this very critical realm.

Perhaps because of my interest in the field of medical research, I have had an opportunity recently to become well acquainted with Dr. Sidney Farber, the great professor of pathology at the Harvard Medical School and head of the Children's Hospital for Cancer and Related Diseases in Boston. Dr. Farber has the heartbreaking and challenging task of having responsibility over 300 children who are afflicted with cancer and with various forms of cancer, such as leukemia. I doubt if any human being could have such a responsibility without being deeply moved and emotionally touched. Sidney Farber is a person of warm humanitarian impulses. Dr. Farber said to me: "Senator, I could not carry on the task each day of being with hundreds of children who are doomed to die of cancer unless I felt that somehow, somewhere, we would make a discovery, a breakthrough which would spare children in the future of this dreadful fate."

Then Dr. Farber went on to say—and I am trying to paraphrase his words as accurately as I can from remembering an experience which was so vivid to me—"Senator, when that time comes, and when that marvelous event occurs, there is one man, not in the field of science or medicine, who will deserve credit along with those in the field of medicine and related sciences, and that man is your colleague in the United States Senate, LISTER HILL."

I doubt that anyone could go through either dictionaries or various thesauri of the English language and express a greater tribute to a person than what was said about Senator HILL by this man who is trying to keep alive little children who suffer from leukemia or other forms of cancer.

A few weeks ago Mrs. Neuberger and I visited the National Institutes of Health, because I felt that we should see for ourselves this phase of our Government about which we have been talking in the

Senate. We spent the better part of a day in the companionship of the doctors who are studying at the clinical center the cases which might lead to further discoveries in the field of malignancies, heart disorders, arthritis, mental diseases, and other ailments that plague the human race. We saw for ourselves the dedicated service of the doctors, nurses, and technicians at this core and heart of the Government's medical-research program.

I would presume too much on the time of the Senate if I were to relate all the favorable things that I heard said about the pioneering work of Senator LISTER HILL in this field. I can say, however, that few men in their time leave behind them enduring monuments, but the prolonging of human life and the relieving of human suffering will be the most enduring monument that any Senator could possibly leave. Such an edifice will be the work done in the field of health research and the required appropriations for undertaking that work by our colleague, the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to express my very humble and deep appreciation to the Senator from Oregon for his generous words.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I merely wish to add that every word was meant from the heart. I cannot emphasize that too strongly.

Mr. President, in conclusion I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the newsletter of June 11, 1956, written by my wife Maurine and myself, which indicates our appreciation and thankfulness over the increases in support for the National Institutes of Health last year. The same sentiments prevail now as were expressed in this newsletter of ours entitled "On the Frontier of Life and Death."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Richard and Maurine Neuberger)

ON THE FRONTIER OF LIFE AND DEATH

Readers of our newsletter will remember the speeches we made in the 1954 campaign, urging an increase in Federal funds for medical research, particularly toward trying to find the cause and cure of that grim killer, cancer. Some editorials were hostile. Others claimed we were extravagant, forgetting that 40 million people among our present population are doomed to be afflicted by cancer.

Anyhow, we have pounded away ever since arriving in the Senate. I became a cosponsor of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH's bill for greatly expanded appropriations in the realm of medicine and medical education. After all, a Nation which spends billions for armament and for liquor and tobacco, should not be parsimonious when methods for prolonging human life may be lurking just beyond the research scientist's microscope or test tube.

Our efforts have helped, perhaps, to bring results. Where the most troublesome of all maladies exist, appropriations for fiscal 1957 have practically been doubled over the present fiscal year. Compare the figures, as just reported by Senator LISTER HILL's committee:

	1956	1957
National Cancer Institute.....	\$24, 978, 000	\$48, 432, 000
National Institute of Health, operating budget.....	5, 929, 000	11, 922, 000
Mental health functions.....	18, 001, 000	35, 197, 000
National Heart Institute.....	18, 898, 000	33, 396, 000
Dental health functions.....	2, 176, 000	6, 026, 000

In our opinion, these are virtually the most important Government appropriations of all. Can a warship, a dam, a highway, compare even remotely with some miraculous discovery which might lead to the solving of the terrible riddle of malignancy? Oregon residents will be proud to know that Senator WAYNE MORSE made a powerful speech against fiscal stinginess where funds involving human life are concerned.

I still believe these present sums, substantial though they are in contrast with earlier years, are not enough. The atom was never cracked until President Franklin D. Roosevelt set aside \$2 billion for a crash program to do the job. Under this impetus, a generation of research and discovery was crammed into a few years. Why not the same sense of urgency in launching an all-out attack by science and knowledge against cancer, heart disease, and mental illness?

All of you have read how this administration is supposed to emphasize human values. Yet budget requests by the administration in these vital areas of cancer, mental health, heart, and dentistry totaled only 61 percent as much as the funds authorized by the Senate. Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to endorse everything which has been said on the floor about the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I do not believe there has ever been a Member of the United States Senate who has had a more distinguished career in this body than has Senator HILL. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who has more personal friends among his colleagues than has Senator HILL.

I think history will record that during its long history there has never been a Member of the Senate who has more constructive legislation bearing his name than has Senator HILL. The country is better off because of the distinguished service which he has rendered. I wish him many more years of constructive service in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I express my heartfelt appreciation and thanks to the Senator from Mississippi for his very generous remarks.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. I think he deserves them.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to refer briefly to a matter to which I referred earlier this morning when I said that at a later time today I would discuss a misunderstanding which I believe developed in the debate on the floor of the Senate yesterday. Not that it concerns me particularly, because I know the Senator from Rhode Island very well, and I know of the kindness of his heart and the absence of any intention on his part of any desire to make any criticism of the work of any committee.

However, because of the unfortunate reference in the press this morning to a part of the debate, I believe in fairness to all concerned, there should be clarification of an exchange which occurred on the Senate floor yesterday in regard to a document relating to the problems of hungry children in the District of Columbia, which was printed as Senate Document No. 43, by authorization of the Senate. The Senator from Rhode Island and I were engaged in debate. We were discussing the position taken by the District of Columbia Committee with regard to the need for 89 additional schoolteachers.

The Senator from Rhode Island said:

Mr. PASTORE. Did the Committee on the District of Columbia hold a hearing on that item?

Mr. MORSE. We had a long hearing on the educational system of the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. Am I to understand that the District of Columbia Committee held a hearing on this particular item while the Appropriations Committee was also considering it?

Mr. MORSE. Not in the case of the 89 teachers.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not.

Mr. MORSE. But we made a survey of the entire matter.

Mr. PASTORE. But the whole survey is a platitude and a generalization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, why does the Senator from Rhode Island say the whole survey is a platitude and a generalization? The survey is based upon detailed evidence on issue after issue, as the evidence was presented before the committee.

It is apparent that the Senator and I were talking about two different things. He was talking with regard to one item, the 89 teachers, and I was talking about the report of the committee, in which reference was made to a good many issues. Certain references in the press this morning allege that the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island was interpreted as criticizing the report of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which certainly was not the intention of the Senator from Rhode Island. I am sure he will understand why I make this statement on the floor of the Senate. Some ardent supporters of the District of Columbia Committee within the District of Columbia have called this morning about this matter. I do not want from what appears in the RECORD any unjust inference to be drawn about the Senator from Rhode Island, the committee or anyone else.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Let me say that if in any way I have caused any distress to my distinguished and very intimate friend from Oregon, I regret it very much. On the other hand, if it is a misunderstanding, I am very quick to try to clarify the matter. Naturally, in the heat of debate, there occur retorts and refutations and rebuttals and other statements, and sometimes on the spur of the moment a general statement is made that may lead to some misunderstanding.

Certainly that was not the intent of the junior Senator from Rhode Island. We were talking at the time, as I recall, about the 89 schoolteachers. I was trying to pinpoint that as a specific matter.

When I said, "platitude and generalization," I had reference to the whole panorama of the survey with reference to the school problem and the social problem. I meant to say, I hope I did say, and I am sorry that anyone should have misunderstood what I did say, that so far as the 89 teachers were concerned, that matter had not been discussed in the survey; that the survey, of its very nature, had to be a general, overall study of the educational and the social problem in the community.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. PASTORE. If there has been any misunderstanding, I hope my remarks this morning have clarified the situation.

I repeat: If I have caused any embarrassment or distress to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I am very sorry for it, and I hope what I have said will clarify the matter.

Mr. MORSE. It has not caused any embarrassment or distress to me. As the Senator knows, that is pretty hard to do. But in fairness to the Senator from Rhode Island I think it should also be pointed out that when the surveys were presented to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Rhode Island, I felt, went out of his way to be very helpful and very complimentary of the work which the Committee on the District of Columbia was doing.

I told the Senator then, and I tell him now, that I appreciate that very much. I say for the RECORD today that I am satisfied—in fact, I am willing to predict today—that with respect to the recommendations on which we shall seek action by way of legislative change in the years immediately ahead, recommendations which are covered by this particular survey, and which go to the matter of human welfare, the Senator from Rhode Island will be on our side more often than he will be against us.

Mr. PASTORE. I remember very well the incident to which the Senator has referred. As a matter of fact, the appearance of the distinguished Senator from Oregon before our committee was very helpful. I say as sincerely and honestly as I can say it that if there was only one motivation which the distinguished Senator from Oregon had in presenting his report to our committee, it was the bigness of his heart. I said then, and I now repeat, that I have the highest respect and admiration for the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He included in his report many things—and many of the statements he made before our subcommittee to relate to things—which are very close to my interest and of great concern to me. I hope the day will come in this community when serious attention and thought will be given and action will be taken with respect to the report submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that statement. The Senator from Rhode Island is quite correct in saying that in the heat of debate, when we as lawyers are pressing as hard as we can the points we are urging, sometimes others misunderstand the motivation of our language.

I want the Senator from Rhode Island to know that if, in our debate yesterday anything I said could possibly be interpreted as a reflection upon him, that was not my intent, because he knows, as I think it is very proper for me to say, that our friendship is one which I consider to be one of the most intimate I have. No criticism of the Senator from Rhode Island was intended by any of our exchanges yesterday.

Mr. PASTORE. If I loved the Senator from Oregon before the debate took place, then I love him even more afterward.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier in the day, when I was discussing the remarkable work done by the Senator from Alabama in the field of appropriations for health research, I neglected to mention a matter which I believe should be stated today on the floor of the Senate. After all, I am of the opinion that none of these great gains could have been made, had it not been for the complete cooperation of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee. I certainly believe his name should be mentioned here, in connection with the great strides which have been made in the making available of funds for the National Institutes of Health, in particular, under the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I believe that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is always magnanimous, will have no objection to my making reference to the complete cooperation he has received in this respect from the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, not only have I no objection, but I am gratified and very happy that the Senator from Oregon has paid this tribute to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], because certainly the Senator from Arizona richly deserves every word that has been said of him by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I feel certain that we would not have had the salutary results in medical-research funds which have been achieved through the direct guidance of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] if it had not been for the excellent work of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HILL. That is entirely correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the item of \$5 million for grants for library services. I know the Senator from Alabama is aware of the fact that Congress authorized an annual appropriation of \$7,500,000, I believe, for a period of 5 years.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Last year, there was an appropriation of \$2,050,000. Of course, the item in this bill is more than twice that large; namely, \$5 million.

My State is one of those which has taken advantage of this program. By means of these contributions, bookmobiles have been placed in service in the counties of Kentucky. Kentucky has joined with private organizations in providing all the matching funds required in order to make the program wholly effective; and in a period of 3 years the circulation of books through this service in my State has increased from zero—except for the circulation of books through agencies already in existence—to 2 million books in 1953–54, and to 5 million books in the next year, and to 6 million books last year.

I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama whether, from his study of the program and the bill, he can say that the \$5 million appropriation will permit States such as mine, which have taken advantage of the program, to complete their programs; and will the Federal Government be able to match the funds provided by the States?

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky—and I know of his great interest in this matter—that I cannot say it will permit his State to complete its program. But I can say that the \$5 million provided in the bill will permit the State of Kentucky to make very definite progress with its program. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, the \$5 million item in the bill is \$2 million above the budget estimate, which was for only \$3 million.

As the Senator from Kentucky also knows, the program is a new one. The authorization legislation was enacted only at the last session of Congress; and in one of the very last deficiency appropriation bills at the last session, we included an appropriation of \$2,050,000 for the program.

The pending bill carries an appropriation of \$5 million, which is \$2 million above the budget estimate of \$3 million, which means that certainly very definite progress can be made by Kentucky, Alabama, and other States.

Furthermore, the committee has included in the bill language which will permit all the \$5 million to be used. In other words, we have followed a precedent which we have followed with reference to other funds, when there is a cooperative program between the Federal Government and the States or the local communities, namely, inasmuch as some States will not be able to go forward with their programs, since perhaps their legislatures have not met, or have not passed the necessary enabling legislation, we provide that when the funds are not used by some States, such unused funds can be allocated to the States which are ready to go forward, and are going forward, with their programs.

So, I think we can say that by means of the increase of \$2 million over the budget estimate, the State of Kentucky and the other States which are ready to go forward can make very definite progress with their programs.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I know he joins me in the belief that this library program offers an opportunity to bring books to thousands and even millions of people who live in remote areas and do not have an opportunity to share in the service of the city libraries.

Mr. HILL. Yes; as the Senator from Kentucky says, today there are millions of persons who have no library service at all, and many more millions who have wholly inadequate library service.

I know how interested the Senator from Kentucky is in this matter. He made to our committee a strong statement in behalf of this appropriation item.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, let me say there is really nothing I could add to the well-deserved tribute which has been paid to the Senator from Alabama for his support of many humanitarian, humane measures in many fields of legislation. Not only has he given them his support, but, as has been stated, he has initiated great programs which well serve the country.

I know something of the high regard in which the Senator from Alabama is held in my own State, where he has visited and has spoken. I know that the people of Kentucky have said that he is a humanitarian and that he has humane ideals; but, better still, he has carried his ideals into practical effect.

So I join with the other Senators who have paid their tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky, and I express to him my deep appreciation for his kind and generous words.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I, too, wish to join in the very fine and well-deserved tribute which has been paid to him.

Previously, I talked to the Senator from Alabama about a problem concerning my State; it involves the Indian colony at Elko, Nev. The committee was asked to include in the bill an item of \$40,000, for the purpose of building sewer and water facilities, as an emergency health matter, within the city limits of Elko, Nev.

In the committee, I pointed out that there is precedent for making this particular approach, because exactly the same thing was done in the case of the needed sanitary facilities in other Nevada towns.

After complete control of the construction of sanitary facilities was given to the Department of the Interior, the duties of the Department in that regard, in the case of sanitation and health matters, were transferred to the Health Service, in 1955.

In the committee I asked why, with that precedent in mind, these steps could not be taken, insofar as the Pub-

lic Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are concerned with this particular situation.

I have been advised by the chairman of the subcommittee that this item was not allowed. I wonder whether he will give us an explanation of the reason therefor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Nevada ask the question.

He appeared before our subcommittee, and he made an excellent and most persuasive statement.

The difficulty in this case is that there is no authorization for this appropriation item, although there is pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee a bill which would authorize the appropriation to which the Senator has referred.

From the statement of the Senator from Nevada, it seems to me that this is an appropriation which should be made, and that this work should be done. I hope the Senator may be able to get action on the authorization bill, and that we may take the matter up at a little later date, in a supplemental appropriation bill. As the Senator knows, under the rules of the Senate it is not necessary for the authorization of an appropriation to pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President. If the bill can be reported by a Senate committee and passed by the Senate, it is completely in order to put the appropriation in an appropriation bill.

Certainly, the Senator made a very strong case before our committee. I hope the authorization may be provided, so we can go forward with the appropriation.

Mr. BIBLE. I very much appreciate the cooperation, the friendly attitude, and the statement of the Senator from Alabama.

I may point out that there was an area of doubt as to the necessary authority in this particular matter. It was my hope, since it had been accomplished before, when the Interior Department had exactly the same functions, that the purposes could be accomplished under a transfer.

I may say further that there is pending before the House a specific authorization bill, in order to clear up the area of doubt. It has passed a subcommittee of the House. It is before the full committee of the House on this very day.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his assurance that, as this bill moves along its legislative path, we shall have the opportunity of having the matter considered again when a supplemental appropriation bill comes before the Senate. I cannot stress too strongly the critical health problem involved and the need for attention to it.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Nevada he will have my full cooperation in getting consideration of this matter.

Mr. BIBLE. I certainly appreciate that statement.

Mr. MORSE. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I wish to say first that nothing has been said by way of commendation of the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], with which I do not completely wish to associate myself.

I should like to add, Mr. President, that in the day-by-day grind of our work in the Senate—and that accurately describes it, because I believe I can be a witness to the fact that probably few people realize the strenuous nature of service in the Senate and the amount of effort individual Senators put into it—I think sometimes we are not always, as Senators, fully appreciative of the services other Senators render to each one of us and render to the people of the States we represent. I do not know of a case in which such a comment is more apropos than in connection with the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I believe no Member of this body will dissent from the point of view I now express, that each of the other 94 Senators is greatly indebted to the Senator from Arizona for the many services he renders. On behalf of the people of my State I wish to express these words of appreciation today.

We are dealing here with a bill which embraces appropriation provisions with respect to health. I share in all the tributes and commendations which have been uttered with respect to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], but in my judgment, Mr. President, there is no man in the Senate who could more appropriately be called the major sponsor of humanitarian legislation in the appropriation field, as it relates to the health of American citizens, than the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I like to think of LISTER HILL as a disciple of CARL HAYDEN in this field. If we wish to use another figure of speech, he is a very able pupil of a wonderful legislative teacher, CARL HAYDEN. I like to think of these health bills as monuments which will constitute for decades living tributes to CARL HAYDEN's wonderful legislative work.

Certainly the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] deserve the high tributes of the Senate for the great work they have done in the same field. Year after year LISTER HILL comes before the Senate with the subcommittee appropriation report. It is interesting that seldom, as we say in Senate cloakroom language at least, is there a "hassle" over a Lister Hill report, because he always has his reports in the excellent shape in which this report today is drawn. As one Senator I wish to thank along with him, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the other members of the subcommittee, for the fine work they do on this subject matter.

I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that any questions which I raise

about this report are not based upon any criticism at all, but are merely seeking information, and are designed to make legislative history. They are only propounded in an effort to pave the way for a future program which may really strengthen the hand of the Senator from Alabama next year and the year after, as he brings other appropriation requests before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the Senator for the very kind words he has spoken of the Senator from Alabama. I particularly wish to express my appreciation for what he has said about the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

When I first became a Member of the House of Representatives, as a very young man, the distinguished Senator from Arizona was a Member there. He was there rendering fine service, just as we see him here day by day contributing to what the Senate does. He is a man whose name is seldom seen in the headlines. In fact, we seldom see his name in the newspaper. He is too busy with his work here for that. Day after day he is faithfully carrying the tremendous burden that falls to the lot of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. He is always at his place working, laboring and fighting for the welfare of the people.

There is really no way for us to express the appreciation which is due the Senator from Arizona for all the work he does and the contribution he makes to the labors of the Senate.

I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has paid his tribute to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MORSE. I think what I have said about the Senator from Arizona is a gross understatement. I hope in private conversation with him some of these days to express myself even more intimately and affectionately than I think perhaps would be appropriate on the floor of the Senate.

I should like to say to the Senator from Alabama that I have been very glad to discover, as I have studied the report, that the Senator, as chairman of the subcommittee, and his colleagues on the subcommittee, have not been caught up in what I would call a sort of whirlwind gust of economy at the expense of human needs. Certainly we should save the taxpayers money when it can be saved, but, in my judgment, we are not making any true saving when we seek to reduce needed appropriations to protect the health of the people.

I am glad to read this report and the figures contained in it, and to take note of the fact that no meat ax was used. On the contrary, the committee held its ground in almost every instance by providing at least the amount of the budget estimate. I think I would have favored some recommendations over and above the budget requests in certain instances, as I shall point out in a moment, but I have gone through the report, and I am pleased to be able to say to my constituents that I do not think the Hill subcommittee engaged in any false economy

in this report. By false economy I mean the cutting of budget estimates in any way which could not be justified on the basis of the evidence before the committee.

For example, I notice on page 14 of the report, in connection with funds for the study of venereal disease problems, that the committee held fast to the budget request; likewise with regard to funds for tuberculosis. There was a slight reduction in the item for communicable diseases—not much, but some. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama can tell us why the committee decided that it should not recommend the full amount in that instance.

Mr. HILL. The House allowed \$6,200,000. We increased the amount to \$6,250,000, which is only \$10,000 below the budget estimate. In other words, with an estimate of \$6,260,000 we are \$10,000 below the estimate. The fact is that the Department did not ask for the restoration of the additional \$60,000, but we put the amount back to \$6,250,000.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator made the latter point. This is a case in which the Department did not ask for the restoration. The responsibility, therefore, in part at least, must be placed at the door of the executive department itself. After all, I think we must admit that the presumption, in the first instance, ought to be in favor of the Department's request. When we go above the Department's request, we must have good cause, on the basis of the evidence presented, for doing so. I am glad we are making a record on the point that the Department itself did not ask for the \$60,000 restoration.

Mr. HILL. We are only \$10,000 below the budget estimate. The figure is \$6,250,000.

Mr. MORSE. I turn now to page 15, under the heading "Sanitary Engineering Activities"; also the item headed "Grants for Waste Treatment Works Construction."

In connection with sanitary engineering activities, the budget estimate was \$13,063,000. The committee recommended \$12,640,000.

In the case of grants for waste treatment, the budget estimate was \$50 million, and the committee allowed \$45 million.

I think the Senator from Alabama knows the great interest of the Senator from Oregon in the subject of stream pollution control. I happen to believe that among all our domestic issues it is doubtful if anyone could name one more important than the conservation of America's water supply. The Senator has heard me say many times—but it needs to be said many more times—that civilizations do not climb with falling water tables. History proves that as the water table of a nation goes down its civilization soon follows.

In this country, in my judgment, we are inexcusably wasteful of our water. We are guilty of unconscionable pollution of our streams and our water resources.

In 1956, as I recall, we passed the so-called Blatnik bill dealing with water pollution. It contained provision for at

least some Federal aid to municipalities, which desired to build modern sewage-disposal plants.

In view of my great interest in the problem, I thought that, for the legislative record, I should ask the Senator from Alabama the reason for the reductions below the budget estimates for sanitary engineering activities and grants for waste treatment.

Mr. HILL. According to the testimony before the committee dealing with grants for waste treatment, the committee recommendation of \$45 million will provide funds for all projects which would be provided for if we had recommended the full \$50 million in the bill, on this basis: Some of the States and localities are not ready to go forward with these works. As the Senator knows, this is a new program. The legislation authorizing it was introduced in the House by Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and was passed only in the closing days of the previous session of Congress.

We are assured that the \$45 million recommended by the committee will take care of all the projects which are ready to go forward, to as full an extent as though we had provided the full amount of \$50 million in the bill. So this reduction in no way cuts down the program. If the Senator will notice the language in connection with the appropriation, it is made clear that the allotments are made on the basis of \$50 million.

All the projects can go forward. No single project will be denied by reason of this reduction.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to make this record and have the comments of the Senator from Alabama.

Some weeks ago I spoke at a conference of Southern States, held at Raleigh, N. C., on the municipal sanitation problem. I found a remarkable interest in the implementation of the Blatnik bill.

I also found, in the discussions which took place at that conference, that some of our municipal officials were surprised to learn that funds are available. Therefore, I should like to use this debate as a springboard for giving a little advice to the Department concerned. I think it needs to do a better job of informing the municipalities of America about this program.

Mr. HILL. The funds are available.

Mr. MORSE. The funds are available; and next year the Senator from Alabama will have justification for recommending a much larger sum, on the basis that there will then be a clamor for Federal aid in this field by an increasing number of municipalities. Too many municipalities throughout the country are polluting streams by turning them into open sewers filled with raw sewage, when they ought to be building pollution-control plants and sewage-disposal plants.

The purpose of the Blatnik bill was to encourage them to do that very thing. I am taking the time to raise the point in regard to this item, because if we are to stop stream pollution, the municipalities have a duty to take this problem to their taxpayers and to urge that bond

issues be voted, if necessary, to raise the municipal contribution to such a program as this, thus permitting it to qualify for this aid.

We are talking in Washington, D. C. I therefore also give that little advice to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and to the more than 500 "aldermen" of the District of Columbia, the Members of Congress. I believe that we aldermen ought to do a much better job of providing for sewage disposal here in the Capital City of the Nation. Since Washington has a hybrid type of government, under which no one gets a chance to vote on municipal affairs except Members of the Congress, we ought to encourage the District Commissioners to try to apply to the District the provisions of the Blatnik bill. I know of no reason why it should not apply to the District of Columbia. Of course, I know it will be said, "We have some plants and some improvements in our plants." However, the fact is that the sewage-disposal improvements which have been made in the District of Columbia in the past few years are already obsolete. The time has come to have a real sewage-disposal system in the District of Columbia, which will not dump into the Potomac River any material which would make it undesirable to use the water of the area for recreational purposes, such as swimming and boating. That has not been done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator include also fishing?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and good fishing, too. I should like to be able to enjoy some good fishing in the Potomac.

I desire also to commend the Senator for the recommendation on page 22 of the report with respect to the National Cancer Institute. The budget estimate was \$46,902,000, the House allowance was the same, and the committee recommendation was \$58,543,000.

The Senator from Alabama and I covered that point. We must face the fact that with respect to the terrible plague of cancer—and that is what it is becoming—we have a public responsibility as Senators to appropriate money and to do whatever can be done to seek to conquer it.

I wish particularly to commend the Senator with reference to the item for mental health activities, on page 23 of the report. The 1958 budget estimate was \$35,217,000, and the committee recommendation is \$39,421,000. I wish to say offhand that I think that is the type of item which could be increased, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. There is available an unexpended balance of \$4,573,000. Therefore the total amount available will be \$43,994,000, or practically \$44 million.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator will agree with me that the mentally sick are in many respects the truly forgotten people of America.

Mr. HILL. Certainly in the past they have been the forgotten people.

Mr. MORSE. That has been true in State after State.

Mr. HILL. They are put into institutions and the doors are closed on them. After that, in many cases, that is the end so far as they are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. The situation is being improved.

Mr. HILL. The situation is improving because of tranquilizing drugs and other drugs, and because new techniques have been developed. It is interesting to note that until last year there was an increase in the number of patients in the mental hospitals. There was an increase each year at the rate of approximately 10,000. In other words, each year 10,000 more people entered mental institutions than had been in them in the previous year. Last year, for the first time, there was a definite trend in the other direction, and instead of an increase, there was a decrease of 7,000.

Mr. MORSE. It is very gratifying to hear the Senator say that, as well as to hear the report made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] earlier in the discussion. It shows what can be done when a State proceeds to make the mental health problems of the State a matter, if not a major concern, certainly a considerable concern of the State government. There is no doubt that every dollar spent for mental health is a dollar well spent.

There is scarcely a Senator who cannot point to a case close to him, involving a friend or an associate or perhaps someone else, who, to his utter surprise all at once develops a mental condition that tends to become progressively worse unless quick treatment is given and facilities for quick treatment are made available to him.

We owe it to our fellow men, from humanitarian motivations, to see to it that we never economize on this item.

I am glad to know the Senator says an unexpended balance is available and therefore the total amount available is approximately \$43 million.

Mr. HILL. The total amount available is \$43,994,000, or almost \$44 million.

Mr. MORSE. I also wish to commend the Senator for the item concerning arthritis and metabolic disease activities, as shown on page 27 of the report. The budget estimate was \$17,885,000, and the committee recommendation is \$23,548,000.

Before I ask my question I wanted to say these things about the report.

Mr. HILL. I may say that there is also an increase over the budget estimate for the National Heart Institute.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I wanted to comment on that also. Again I am glad to see an increase for that item. No one should be guilty of any economizing with respect to any of these research projects or research funds in connection with any of the serious diseases which threaten the health of America.

Mr. HILL. I may say that there is also a very definite increase in the funds available for neurology and blindness. That takes in, of course, epilepsy and cerebral palsy and deafness and blindness, and other ailments.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to have him help me make a little legislative history

on another item. We have done that before. I should like to refresh the Senator's recollection as to the history of the project. The Senator knows that for the past 2 years the Senator from Oregon, the 2 Senators from Virginia, and the Senator from Alabama himself, of course, have been very much interested in a pilot rehabilitation center in Virginia. It is connected with the Anderson Clinic in Arlington, Va., but not connected with it in any financial way. It is a pilot rehabilitation center. It is headed by a fine doctor, Dr. O. Anderson Engh, who in my opinion performs, far beyond anything that is called for in the line of duty, a great many humanitarian services for the people of this area and the patients who are sent to him.

The Senator will recall that some years ago, when this particular appropriation was before the Senate, we provided within it language which would authorize the expenditure of funds to help conduct the services of the pilot rehabilitation center, but no funds for construction. The Senator will also recall, I am sure, that this particular clinic is certainly an excellent example of what the people of a community can do by way of voluntary contributions not only of money, but also of personal service, in order to come to the humanitarian aid of fellow citizens who because they are unfortunately suffering from terrible physical handicaps need vocational rehabilitation.

In the Arlington-Alexandria area—and I should like to repeat this for the RECORD this year—a small group of community organizations and agencies—the Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, the Lions Club, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and various church groups and women's organizations—have devoted their personal services as well as their time and considerable money to this so-called pilot rehabilitation center. That center is located in Arlington, Va.

The RECORD should show also, before I ask the Senator from Alabama any questions about this, that to this center, under the direction of the distinguished Dr. Engh, were sent a good many Federal employees, not only from the District of Columbia, but from elsewhere in the United States who had been injured at their work.

Speaking now only hypothetically, and not in relation to any specific case—but it is typical—assume that this afternoon someone in the State Department should walk into an open elevator shaft, fall down, and injure his or her spine, and that as a consequence partial paralysis overtook the person. It is quite possible that the Federal employee might be sent to the so-called Engh Clinic for rehabilitation.

It happens to be the theory of Dr. Engh that the program should be, as he says, under one roof. There is the possibility of permanent muscular disability fixing itself upon the patient. The problem, then, is one of vocational rehabilitation and guidance, so that the person can be brought back into productive life. Such a pilot plant, we have agreed in the past, is needed. So language has been provided in bills heretofore to make it possible for the Depart-

ment to place some money in the clinic to help with the program.

As the Senator from Alabama is aware, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has introduced a bill on this subject, S. 2068. I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. 2068 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2068) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 4 (b) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U. S. C. 34 (b)) is amended to read as follows: "Sums made available for such a pilot demonstration center in the Washington area may be used for the construction of facilities, including future expansion, equipment, and such services as hospitalization, domiciliary care, and rehabilitation training, including costs of board and room of trainees and other services essential to the program, as in the discretion of the Secretary are deemed desirable."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama knows that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and I, after studying the matter, came to the conclusion, to which the Senator from Alabama agreed, that if any funds were to be used for construction purposes, it would be necessary to pass new authorizing legislation. So the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] introduced S. 2068, which provides for an amendment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, to read as follows:

Sums made available for such a pilot demonstration center in the Washington area may be used for the construction of facilities, including future expansion, equipment, and such services as hospitalization, domiciliary care, and rehabilitation training, including costs of board and room of trainees and other services essential to the program, as in the discretion of the Secretary are deemed desirable.

Am I not correct in my understanding that the appropriation bill of which the Senator from Alabama is in charge today does not include any language which would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to use any of the funds being appropriated to that agency for construction purposes at the Engh Rehabilitation Clinic?

Mr. HILL. The bill does not carry any funds for construction purposes at the Engh Clinic, because there is no authorization for the appropriation of such funds. As the Senator from Oregon well knows, the purpose of the bill introduced by our colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], is to authorize the appropriation of such funds.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true, however, that such funds as are appropriated in the bill to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, can, as in the past, in the judgment of the Secretary, be used for assistance to the Engh Clinic, except that the funds may not be used for construction?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama knows of nothing in the appropriation bill which would in any way affect

the terms of the basic act, which we know as the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954, under which funds were made available to the Engh Clinic for maintenance and operation.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Alabama will now put on another committee hat for a moment, and speak to me as the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it is true, is it not, that S. 2068 is pending before the Senator's committee, of which I also have the honor to be a member, and that the bill will be scheduled for hearing, so that Dr. Engh, the junior Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Oregon, and others interested in the bill may have an opportunity to make an official record in support of the bill?

Mr. HILL. We shall be delighted to schedule hearings on the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Virginia. The present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], also is a member of our committee and is a member of the Subcommittee on Health. I am certain he would be delighted to attend the hearing when the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Virginia, and other witnesses appear in behalf of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I am authorized by the junior Senator from Virginia to say that he joins with me in urging that early hearings be held on the bill. I am authorized also to speak on behalf of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in assuring the Senator from Alabama that the senior Senator from Virginia, too, is very much interested in early hearings on the bill and a favorable consideration of it.

Speaking hypothetically, assuming that S. 2068 is favorably reported, is passed by Congress, and is signed by the President before Congress adjourns this year—in fact, a sufficient length of time before adjournment this year so that further consideration could be given to the funds necessary to implement it—is it not the opinion of the Senator from Alabama that appropriate requests still could be made this year for consideration in connection with a supplemental appropriation request?

Mr. HILL. If the bill is passed and becomes law during this session of Congress, it will be entirely in order to ask for an appropriation in a supplemental or a deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. Perhaps I should state my question in this way: Does the Senator from Alabama expect or contemplate that a supplemental or a deficiency appropriation bill probably will be reported to the Senate by his subcommittee before adjournment?

Mr. HILL. Supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills are not handled by subcommittees; they are handled by the full Committee on Appropriations. In the closing days of a session of Congress, invariably a supplemental or a deficiency bill is considered by the full committee.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his assistance.

Mr. President, I shall close now with a very brief statement. I want the REC-

ORD to show that I shall continue to do everything I can to assist the two Senators from Virginia in obtaining favorable action on S. 2068, for these reasons:

I think the Engh Clinic, as a pilot clinic for vocational rehabilitation, is one of the great experimental rehabilitation centers in this country. I recognize that in the medical profession there are different theories and views as to the best way to approach the vocational rehabilitation problem. But the results, in my judgment, are always the test in a matter such as this.

I believe that any evaluation of the results of the remarkable work which Dr. Engh and his associates have been doing in the rehabilitation of persons in connection with the pilot clinic program which he is operating in Arlington, Va., would prove the soundness of the program and justify an appropriation of Federal funds as an aid to the construction of needed additions to that clinic.

Labor has donated thousands of man-hours of overtime in helping to build a wing of that clinic. But the time has come when it is necessary to complete the physical facilities by way of construction by the expenditure of funds, rather than in the expectation that the work can be done completely through the donation of services. There will, however, continue to be a substantial donation of free time on the part of labor in the building trades.

The question, and let us get it before the Senate by way of a preliminary hearing on the bill, is the question of Federal interest. Are we setting up a program that is singular, based upon a Federal interest; or are we proposing support for a program which might equally well be requested by a clinic in San Francisco or El Paso or Boston, Mass., or elsewhere in the Nation? It seems to me the answer is that there is a great Federal interest in the clinic, for a reason I stated earlier, because many injured Federal employees are referred there.

Furthermore, let me make crystal clear, as I speak in advance in support of Senate bill 2068, that this enterprise is not in any way whatsoever a private-business enterprise. Instead, the clinic is conducted by Dr. Engh as a completely humanitarian program. It is separate and distinct from the Anderson Clinic or hospital, in which Dr. Engh is also, as I recall, the head of the medical staff. This is a vocational rehabilitation center. Every dollar of Federal money which would be appropriated to it, following the passage of Senate bill 2068, would be well spent, and would foster what I have been heard to say so frequently is one of the great duties of the Congress, to honor our humanitarian obligation to bring medical aid to unfortunate people who need the specialized service that this rehabilitation center is designed to provide.

I desire to thank the Senator from Alabama for his assistance in enabling me to make the legislative record I have made regarding these items.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the

Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On page 2 of the report, I notice that in the case of the Office of the Solicitor, it was recommended that there be transferred from the highway trust fund an amount of \$365,000; but that after seeking the advice of its counsel, the committee decided against doing so. Can the Senator from Alabama give us a brief explanation of that matter and of why that decision was reached?

Mr. HILL. I may say there was a question of whether these trust funds are available for such a purpose. We submitted the matter to the office of the legislative counsel of the Senate, and we received an opinion that such an appropriation from the trust fund is not authorized. I shall be delighted to ask unanimous consent to have the full opinion of the legislative counsel printed in the RECORD, if the Senator from Arizona would like to have me do so.

Briefly, the legislative counsel held that these funds are for highway-construction purposes, and are not to be transferred to some other agency of the Government, for legal service or other services, but that they are trust funds, and that there is imposed a trust to make sure that they are used for the construction of highways, and are not transferred to other agencies, for use for other services or purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would be very happy to have the Senator from Alabama have the opinion printed in the RECORD, because I have been receiving from the Far West suggestions that this fund is already being tampered with in this respect. This is the first instance I have seen in print of that. I have heard that the highway trust fund is being used to finance other agencies of the Government. If that is true, I think the Senator from Alabama has done a very commendable thing in making the decision he has made.

So I shall appreciate it if the Senator from Alabama will have the full opinion printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL. Certainly. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the opinion of the legislative counsel on the matter of the transfer of the trust fund to the Labor Department, or, for that matter, to any other department.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR HILL

Pursuant to your request we have examined the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 for the purpose of submitting an informal opinion as to whether or not such acts authorize the appropriation of moneys out of the highway trust fund to the Secretary of Labor (or more particularly, to the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor) to defray expenses incurred in carrying out the duties imposed upon him under section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. For the reasons given below, it is our opinion that such an appropriation from the Trust Fund is not authorized.

THE LAW

Section 209 (f) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 reads as follows:

"(f) Expenditures from trust fund.—

"(1) Federal-aid highway program.— Amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations)."

Paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 209 (f) contain authorizations to make expenditures (without further appropriations being made therefor) from the trust fund to repay advances, to reimburse the Treasury for amounts paid with respect to gasoline used on farms or used for nonhighway purposes, and to reimburse the Treasury for certain amounts paid as floor stocks refunds. Section 210 (e) authorizes appropriations out of the trust fund to enable the Secretary of Commerce to make the study and investigation required by section 210. There is no other authority in the act for expending or appropriating moneys from the trust fund, so that if the act authorizes appropriations to the Department of Labor from the trust fund it must be found in the paragraph quoted above.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

There is little in the legislative history of the acts from which to derive assistance in deciding the question posed. The House committee report on H. R. 10660 contains the following statement: "In most respects the highway trust fund is to be handled in a manner similar to that provided for the trust fund for the old-age and survivors insurance program." The Senate committee report contains an identical statement.

In explaining the expenditures referred to in section 209 (f) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, the House report contains the following statement: "The expenditures referred to are those which normally have been paid out of the appropriation entitled 'Federal aid highways, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce'." Again the Senate committee report contained the same statement, although it must be remembered that the bill as reported by the Senate committees did not contain the so-called Davis-Bacon Act provision.

A review of the discussion of H. R. 10660 when it was under consideration on the floors of the House and Senate has failed to disclose any comments pertinent to this inquiry, although a good portion of the debate in both Houses was devoted to the provision which was eventually enacted as section 115.

DISCUSSION

Section 209 (f) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 contains an express authorization for expenditure of the trust fund to meet those portions of the administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads which are payable from appropriations made for Federal-aid highways. Section 21 of the Federal Highway Act (23 U. S. C. 21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to deduct a percentage of the appropriations made for Federal-aid highways to be used for administration of the Federal-aid highway program and for carrying on necessary highway research and investigational studies. No specific amount is appropriated in the annual appropriation acts for the administration by the Bureau of the Federal-aid highway program. While it is likely that, even without the express authorization contained in section 209 (f) (1), the administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public

Roads would, under the authority of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, have continued to be payable from appropriations out of the trust fund for Federal-aid highways, it was evidently felt necessary to eliminate any doubts that might arise by putting the express authorization in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. This authorization continued the existing practice and budgetary procedures with respect to the expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads in administering the Federal-aid highway program. But we should emphasize that this matter was considered to be of sufficient importance to be specifically provided for in the act. The logical inference is that, if the expenses of the Department of Labor were also to be defrayed out of the trust fund, an express authorization would have been included in the act.

While it may be argued that the language of section 209 (f) (1) is broad enough to imply an authorization to use the trust fund to defray the expenses of the Secretary of Labor, we do not believe that such a construction should be placed upon this paragraph in the absence of a more specific indication of legislative intent. Such a construction would make it possible for the expenses of the Secretary of the Treasury in managing and operating the trust fund, the expenses of the Internal Revenue Service in collecting the revenues which go into the trust fund, and the expenses of any other officer or agency of the Government relating to Federal-aid highways to be defrayed from the trust fund. As was noted above, the committee reports indicate that, in general, the highway trust fund is to be handled in a manner similar to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. The Social Security Act expressly authorizes the use of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund to meet or reimburse the administrative expenses incurred by the Treasury Department in implementing that act (including the expenses of collecting the taxes which go into the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund). Without doubt consideration was given to including a similar authorization in the highway trust fund, and it would be expected that a similar express authorization would have been included if the expenses of the Treasury Department in implementing the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 were to be defrayed from the highway trust fund. There appears to be no greater reason for inferring authority to defray from the trust fund the expenses incurred by the Department of Labor in implementing the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 than for inferring authority to defray from the trust fund the expenses incurred by the Treasury Department in implementing such act. In view of the fact that the highway trust fund was patterned after the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, the absence of express authorization to defray administrative expenses, except with respect to the Bureau of Public Roads, seems almost conclusive that no such authorization was intended.

As was stated above, the only statement in the committee reports explaining the meaning of section 209 (f) (1) indicates plainly that the expenditures referred to are those normally paid out of appropriations made to the Bureau of Public Roads for Federal-aid highways. This statement, far from furnishing a basis for inferring a legislative intent to defray the administrative expenses of other agencies out of the trust fund, once more shows that Congress intended that only the administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads be so defrayed, since such expenses had, under authority of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, been paid from such appropriations.

The establishment of a trust fund obviously was to prevent an encroachment upon the increased revenues raised by reason of

the enactment of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as well as to earmark these revenues, and some of the revenues raised from then existing sources, to meet the obligations of the United States under the Federal-aid highway program. Since Congress has seen fit to establish a trust fund for the purpose of meeting these obligations, we believe that the objects for which the trust fund moneys are to be expended should be narrowly, rather than liberally, construed.

CONCLUSIONS

1. There is no express authorization in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 or the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to defray the expenses incurred by the Secretary of Labor under section 115 of the first-named act out of the highway trust fund established by section 209 of the second-named act.

2. There is nothing in either of the two acts from which an authorization to meet such expenses out of the trust fund can properly be implied. Since section 209 (f) (1) contains an express authorization with respect to the administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads, the accepted rules of statutory construction lead to the conclusion that authority to defray the administrative expenses of any other agency out of the trust fund would also have been expressly stated and should not be derived by implication.

3. There is nothing in the legislative history of the two acts which indicates a legislative intent that the expenses of the Secretary of Labor under section 115 are to be met out of the trust fund. The Davis-Bacon Act provision was thoroughly debated on the floors of the House and Senate, but we could find no reference to such a use of the trust fund to meet the expenses of carrying out the provision. The House committee report does not mention such a use. On the other hand, the legislative history does support the conclusion that, with respect to administrative expenses, only the expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads are to be paid from the trust fund. The committee reports of both Houses indicate that the Highway Trust Fund was patterned after the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. This latter trust fund authorizes payment or reimbursement to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (which administers the old-age and survivors insurance program) and the Treasury Department (which administers the trust fund and collects the taxes which go into the trust fund) for their administrative expenses. Therefore, if the Highway Trust Fund is to be available to defray the administrative expenses of any agency other than the Bureau of Public Roads, the act would contain an express authorization for such purpose.

The committee reports also state, in explanation of the trust fund provision, that the expenditures referred to are those normally paid out of the appropriation to the Bureau of Public Roads for Federal-aid highways. Under existing law, the expenses of the Bureau in administering the Federal-aid highway program, are paid from this appropriation.

4. Provisions of law reciting the purposes for which a trust fund may be used should be narrowly construed. In the absence of a strong indication of legislative intent, authorizations for expenditures out of a trust fund should not be created by implication.

Respectfully,

JOHN H. SIMMS,
Legislative Counsel.

MAY 7, 1957.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on page 18 of the report, in connection with the construction of Indian health facilities, I notice that the committee has recommended a reduction of \$2,704,000. Am I correct in assuming that

the reduction is recommended because an abundance of money was left over last year?

Mr. HILL. I would say to my distinguished friend that \$11 million was left over last year, and the \$11 million is available for construction.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On the same page I notice that the committee states that—

This allowance will make available \$2,596,000 to completely modernize 5 Indian health hospitals in line with minimum Hill-Burton standards—

And so forth. Can the Senator from Alabama state the names of the five hospitals?

Mr. HILL. I shall be very glad to obtain the names; it will take a moment to do so.

In the meantime, if the Senator from Arizona will note the next paragraph on page 18 of the report, I wish to call attention to the following:

Funds are now, and have been, available for construction of hospitals at Sells, Ariz., and Gallup, N. Mex.; the need is unquestioned and great, and the committee will expect the Department to proceed immediately with resumption of work already authorized by the Congress.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama for what he has said, because both my senior colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] and I have known for some time of this need. So I hope the Department will listen to the admonition of the Senator from Alabama and the other members of the committee and will get to work on the hospitals.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the five hospitals referred to are as follows:

Pine Ridge Hospital, at Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

Rosebud Hospital, at Rosebud, S. Dak.
Hopi Reservation Hospital, at Keams Canyon, Ariz.

Fort Apache Hospital, at White River, Ariz.

Blackfoot Hospital, at Browning, Mont.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much.

I wish to add my words of commendation to those which have been expressed not only about the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], but also about his professor, my senior colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not want this opportunity to pass without joining in the remarks which have been made in regard to the outstanding job done by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I regret that earlier I was out of the Chamber when other Senators spoke on that subject.

Let me say that some years ago it was my privilege, as a member of the party then in the majority in the Senate, to serve as chairman of the subcommittee over which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] now presides. He and I worked very closely together at that time, when he was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Since

then he has become chairman of the subcommittee; and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has become the ranking minority member.

It has been my personal observation over the years that the Senator from Alabama has not only served with distinction the people of his own State, but he has been one of the most valued Members of this body.

I also wish to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], under whose leadership both of us serve on the Appropriations Committee, has been an inspiration to the entire committee. I feel that with the heavy burdens which sometimes are carried by Members on both sides of the aisle, it is well and it is pleasant, I think, at times for us to express the deep affection we have for our colleagues across the aisle. Even in the heat of partisanship, I think we never lose sight of the fact that in dealing with the great problems of human welfare, and in the day-to-day operations of the Government, there are no real partisanship divisions between us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for his very kind words. I wish to say that when the distinguished Senator from California was chairman of the subcommittee, he did so much and made so many contributions in the different fields covered by the bill, that his example is today an inspiration to our subcommittee, and we are proud that he continues to be a member of the subcommittee. He is always extremely able, devoted, and helpful, and makes many, many fine contributions to the work of the subcommittee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I regret very much that I could not be present earlier; I have been tied up today in committee. Will the Senator from Alabama tell me what the committee did in terms of the apprenticeship-training program, in which I am very much interested.

Mr. HILL. We left that program where it is today, to wit, with the Vocational Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What did the committee do in terms of the appropriation for it?

Mr. HILL. Its appropriation is a part of the appropriation for vocational education. We allowed the entire amount which has been authorized for vocational education. In other words, we recommend the appropriation of the full amount which today is authorized for vocational education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, that is for apprenticeship training in the Department of Labor?

Mr. HILL. No; this is in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What about apprenticeship training in the Department of Labor?

Mr. HILL. The House denied funds for that purpose. The committee did not restore them. As the Senator knows, some question has been raised as to jur-

isdiction in this matter. We provided the full funds for the vocational education program under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but we did not add the funds for the Bureau of Apprenticeship under the Department of Labor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has not that been an established activity of our Government for some time?

Mr. HILL. No. There has been a question, a very serious question, of a conflict as between the two Departments, as to which Department should carry on this work, I will say to the Senator.

Under the circumstances, in view of this disagreement, in view of the fact that the House disallowed this item, and it would have meant an additional appropriation in the bill, the Senate committee did not recommend the inclusion of the item.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say, most respectfully, that this program has been one of the most effective programs in the history of my State. More than 10,000 apprentices have been graduated since 1939, under this program.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has stated that a certain number of apprentices have been graduated. A fine job has been done in his State. Such a program comes under the vocational education program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it comes under the apprenticeship training program of the Department of Labor. The request of the Bureau of the Budget was for \$3 million.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that we allowed \$3,600,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the program is going on?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not worried about who is going to operate it, so long as it continues. I thank the Senator for the information.

I also understand that the budget request for the library services was actually increased. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. It was increased \$2 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask whether there are provided physical rehabilitation facilities under the hospital construction program?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The rehabilitation category is included in the hospital appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator. I thank him very much for his willingness to answer the questions. As the Senator will see, the people of my State are keenly interested in the item we are discussing. I have received two or three hundred letters on the subject. I wanted to assure my correspondents, through this colloquy, the matters had been discussed fully in committee and properly taken care of on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from Alabama tell me what the library appropriation was?

Mr. HILL. \$5 million, which is \$2 million above the budget estimate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Therefore, I can wire back to those who have sent telegrams to me, expressing the hope that the appropriation will be \$5 million, and say the Senator from Alabama and the Senators on his committee have done what they requested.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Mexico can say we recommended it, and the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators adopted the recommendation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Can we also say we salute the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his diligence and his devotion to duty, and we thank him for the kindness of his heart?

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the enrollment of the Senate amendments to the bill, the Secretary be authorized to make changes which may be necessary in the section numbers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER],

the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. CASE] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—70

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Allott	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Neuberger
Barrett	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Beall	Humphrey	Pastore
Bennett	Ives	Payne
Bible	Jackson	Potter
Bricker	Javits	Purtell
Butler	Jenner	Revercomb
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Church	Kennedy	Scott
Cooper	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Dworshak	Lausche	Symington
Eastland	Long	Talmadge
Ellender	Magnuson	Thurmond
Frear	Mansfield	Thye
Goldwater	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Green	Monroney	Williams
Hayden	Morse	
Hennings	Morton	

NOT VOTING—25

Bridges	Douglas	Neely
Bush	Ervin	Robertson
Byrd	Flanders	Saltonstall
Capehart	Fulbright	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Yarborough
Chavez	Malone	Young
Clark	McClellan	
Curtis	McNamara	

So the bill (H. R. 6287) was passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. THYE, Mrs.

SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. IVES conferees on the part of the Senate.

"OPEN CURTAIN" PROPOSAL BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the reaction to the "open curtain" proposal advanced by our majority leader last Saturday indicates clearly that the American people respond to bold and imaginative ideas.

There have been some who have expressed fear of the effect of Soviet Communist statements made openly by the Russians. But most Americans have enough confidence in the strength of our system to realize that it is not going to be toppled by such propaganda.

They agree with the majority leader that the best response would be to take Khrushchev's technique and turn it back upon him. They feel that the Khrushchev broadcast was a glorious opportunity that should be seized upon and turned into a weapon for the spread of the truth.

The Kansas City Star—one of the leading newspapers of my State—sums up the situation well in an editorial. It points out that "the issue boils down to a question of trust in the good sense of the American people."

"Senator JOHNSON bases his approach on confidence in the people," the editorial says.

The editorial also makes the point of the importance of the timing of Senator JOHNSON's remarks. A few years ago, the proposal would have been impractical. Today—because of the Khrushchev broadcast and other developments—the "open curtain" may be attainable.

I ask unanimous that the editorial be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAK THE IRON CURTAIN AND LET IDEAS FLOW

Maybe Senator LYNDON JOHNSON sounded a little idealistic in his New York talk to the annual conference of the United Jewish Appeal Saturday night. But it was idealism grounded in the commonsense of a basic proposition: Our search for eventual peace must start with a policy calling for an open curtain, a policy not only of "open skies but of open eyes, ears, and minds for all the peoples of the world."

A few years ago such a proposition might have been so much a part of the American dream that it would hardly have seemed worth restating. That was when Stalin's Russia had a monopoly on the Iron Curtain.

Plainly Senator JOHNSON was talking to Americans who have themselves become fearful of a free exchange of ideas, a fear of becoming contaminated at least or influenced by the sinister con man of the Kremlin. One example is the substantial criticism of the Khrushchev TV interview for general telecasting in this country. Another example, not mentioned by JOHNSON, is the State Department's opposition to letting American reporters go to Red China. This, too, reflects a rather widespread feeling in this country.

Strangely, many Americans, but certainly not a majority, have become dependent on iron and bamboo curtains raised by their Communist enemies. The issue boils down to a question of trust in the good sense of the American people. Senator JOHNSON

bases his approach on confidence in the people. He says, "I am not afraid to have them listen to Nikita Khrushchev or Karl Marx or Nicolai Lenin himself. They have the intelligence and independence to make up their own minds." To support this view he cites his own Democratic Party's heritage from the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Starting with such confidence the Senate's majority leader calls for every effort in an all-out exchange of ideas or arguments. Let the President or some other high official ask for the right to a telecast in Russia. Let Russian labor leaders speak in this country on condition that American labor leaders speak to their people. And so, he hopes, the exchanges might continue until there would be no curtain to stop the flow of ideas which are the basic approach to any relaxing world tensions.

If you share the confidence in American good sense you do not become alarmed by the fact that the Russians would sling a lot of propaganda in this country. This would simply require informed Americans to stand ready to expose Russian lies to make sure that our public was fully informed. And the American people have had a long experience with separating truth from fancy in the speeches of some of their own politicians.

Frankly, we would be surprised if the Russians would have enough confidence in their system to permit a real flow of free world ideas into their country. They have to face a long record of failing to make communism stand up by any means except force of arms.

But JOHNSON was talking about a sound American, not a Russian, approach. If the Russians would not go along they would have to take the onus for continuing the Iron Curtain. As for the idealism in this approach we only suggest that it will be a sad day for America if it ever loses its native idealism in the search for eventual world peace.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I think all of us who believe in the free exchange of ideas across the wide vistas of the world have been thrilled and inspired during the past week by the great challenge voiced by the majority leader of the United States Senate, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

In the New York Post for Monday, June 10, there was published an illuminating editorial on the proposal of the Senator from Texas, which was originally voiced at a banquet of the United Jewish Appeal, in New York City on June 9. In a free test of philosophies, Senator JOHNSON believes that democracy is certain to win.

I ask unanimous consent that certain salient portions of the editorial from the New York Post of June 10 be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT NONDEBATE

The sad, astonishing thing is that the Communists are exacting vast propaganda dividends out of this episode without even being challenged to permit a free American presentation on their own soil.

Surely this is a competition we should welcome. As Democratic Senate Chieftain LYNDON JOHNSON wisely said the other night, we should be demanding "an open curtain for full discussion" and insisting on "the right to state our case on disarmament in detail to the Soviet people." We need, he said, a policy "not just of open skies" but

"of open eyes, ears, and minds for all peoples of the world." Yet we have blunderingly allowed the Russians to pose as champions of free debate while Messrs. Eisenhower, Meaney, and others mumble disconsolate critiques of CBS.

Frozen minds cry that debate with Khrushchev is as worthless as debate with Adolph Hitler would have been. They miss the point that the Soviet thrust is increasingly being pressed in ideological terms, and that the nature of nuclear weapons has altered all the dimensions of international conflict. In vast uncommitted areas the Communist mystique is infinitely more powerful, complex, and subtle than nazism ever was, and it must be met with something more than strident military posturings.

The CBS Khrushchev interview set the stage for a momentous international debate in which able democratic spokesmen could have exposed the last myths of Communist despotism. Mr. K's comments on Hungary alone could have provided the text for devastating counterattack. But our stars seem determined to remain coyly in the wings, talking to themselves.

LABOR'S DILEMMA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most illuminating section from the report of Norman Zukowsky, general secretary-treasurer, to the Eighth Regular Convention of the International Leather Goods, Plastics, and Novelty Workers' Union at Atlantic City, N. J.

I particularly want to call to the attention of the Senate the recommendations by Mr. Zukowsky that genuine and bonafide friends of the labor movement bring forth legislation which will seek to prevent dishonesty, dictatorship, and embezzlement in the labor movement—lest the enemies of labor impose punitive bills that would impede the ability of our trade unions to protect the living standards and working conditions of their members.

Mr. Zukowsky and his associates have made a significant recommendation, which I believe merits the attention of thoughtful and fair Senators on both sides of the aisle.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR'S DILEMMA

The labor movement as a whole faces a period when hysteria, born of the revelations by the Senate committee probing racketeers, threatens to engulf the Nation and lead to ultrarestrictive, punitive legislative action that will cripple the legitimate trade unions as much—or perhaps even more so—than the corrupt ones which are a minority.

We can deplore the findings of the Senate committee; unfortunately however, we can neither ignore them nor deny them. For the ugly fact is that corruption and racketeering does exist in some unions today. It has deep roots. The labor movement, prior to the current outcry, did not clean its own house.

So even as we point a suspicious finger at the antilabor bias of many of the committee's members and speculate (perhaps correctly in the long run) about the possibility of tough laws, we must admit that without this committee, without its exposures, without the "climate" it helped to create, the AFL-CIO itself would not have been able to move against the crooks and profiteers within its ranks.

Our old and esteemed friend, David Dubinsky, president of the powerful International Ladies Garment Workers Union, made that fact clear in a ringing speech in April on the boardwalk of Atlantic City when he appeared at the UAW convention.

Dubinsky said, in no uncertain terms, that the AFL-CIO would never have been able to clean up except for the Senate committee. He pointed out that the exposures of the Douglas committee on the looting of welfare funds provided the only evidence on which labor was able to move against 3 corrupt internationals and 2 crooked Federal labor unions. He conceded that the actions against Beck would have been impossible without the facts unearthed by the McClellan committee. The AFL-CIO had not made its own investigation; it had no other evidence.

There are fears which I share, that the exposures of the McClellan committee—documented though they are; undeniable though they may be—may do all of labor irreparable harm before the storm dies down. This fear runs through many sections of the labor movement, including many which are violently antiracketeering.

There is, I believe, only one way to cope with this problem. The answer is not, of course, to fight the committee because it has dug up facts which embarrass us. The answer is not to say that after all, industry is corrupt too. (I believe that to be true but it does not alter the fact that some sections of labor are corrupt or crooked.)

The answer is, I believe, in an intelligent counter-offensive by the decent forces in labor, political and community life. This counteroffensive must be predicated on an acceptance of the fact that corruption inside labor has grown to the point where labor alone cannot effectively root it out. Labor must have additional tools—in this instance, legislation—to assist it. But the tools must be of a kind that are made by persons sympathetic with the desire of legitimate labor to clean out the crooks. They must not be tools which hack away at the good and bad at once.

There are many sober minds in Congress grappling with this problem today. There are men who wholeheartedly support the basic aims of decent labor who want to help the unions devise the right kind of laws—laws that will hit at the corrupt but not injure the clean unions.

The leaders of legitimate labor must meet with these men of the stripe of a DICK NEUBERGER or a WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; or an McNAMARA, of Michigan; or a JAVITS or an Ives, of New York, or a KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, to name but a few, and jointly come up with proper recommendations for laws.

For one fact is clear—and it would be suicidal for the leaders of American labor to sidestep it—there will be laws aimed at curbing crooked unions. There is no way of stopping this trend, in my opinion.

It is no longer a question of whether or not laws—it is solely a question of what kind of laws.

I hope that the Meanys, Reuthers, Dubinskys, Potofskys, and other forward-looking national leaders of American labor will take the lead in initiating a national conference with important legislators from both parties in both Houses of Congress—honest conservatives and honest liberals alike—for the purpose of drawing up specific recommendations for the laws that must come.

Only in that way do I envision avoiding the kind of blunderbuss bill which would indiscriminately hit all unions—good and bad. And only in that way can labor win the respect of the community as a whole, without which we cannot fulfill our traditional historic mission as a force for good for our members and for the State, city, or village in which we live and work.

The theme of these comments has, as you have noted, been political. This was deliberate, for labor must—more than ever before—participate in the political arena and not just to act as a check and balance against the extremists who will try to use the McClellan findings for hysterical purposes, but literally to safeguard the gains union members have made through the years.

What is gained today in a union contract can be wiped out tomorrow by some piece of repressive legislation. A hard-won standard on one level can be offset by a reactionary State legislature, for example, which can rewrite some statute.

The point needs no elaboration here. You all know what I mean. And the sudden rash of so-called right-to-work laws in State after State—and the introduction of national law of that kind in Congress—is just the opening gun.

If we sit back and hope to live as a union solely on the basis of a union contract, we are not only in for a rude awakening but we do not deserve to be invested with the responsibilities of administering our union. Political apathy is political suicide today.

KAISER STEEL CORP. EXPANSION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the most astounding aspects of the tremendous population growth and industrial development in California, and in the West generally, during and since World War II has been the development of new industries and the utilization of resources on the Pacific coast and in the Mountain States.

Only a century ago, California was the American frontier. Today, with a population approaching 15 million, California is a vital and integral factor in the entire American economy.

Much of the amazing development of the past two decades can be traced to the establishment of completely new industries. And as such new ventures prospered, other activities started and flourished until today California is the source of a great variety of products shipped all over our Nation and all around the world.

An impressive example of the constant expansion of our western economy was an announcement recently that the Kaiser Steel Corp., a company which has contributed in a host of ways to the industrial progress of California, will increase an expansion program which had been budgeted at \$113 million by an additional \$81 million.

This undertaking is emphatic proof, I believe, of the pace at which California is forging ahead. When the Kaiser program is completed, the capacity of the West's biggest steel producer will be virtually doubled. A plant first constructed in the early days of World War II, in an area devoted to citrus growing and other types of agriculture, it will have the ability to turn out 3 million tons annually and supply materials which are in great demand and essential to the expanding economy of California and our neighboring States as well.

The new undertaking is truly ambitious. It is evidence of faith in the future, and proof that the company's earlier confidence was justified. The increased program will provide Kaiser's plant at Fontana in San Bernardino County, not far from my own home community, with a fourth blast furnace, a

Began debate on H.R. 8090, the public works appropriation bill for 1958.
pp. 8573-82

Received from the President supplemental appropriation estimates for
1958 for various agencies (H. Doc. 198); to Appropriations Committee. p. 8587

Conferees were appointed on H.R. 6287, the Labor-H.E.W. appropriation
bill for 1958. Senate Conferees were appointed June 12. p. 8538

17. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill to provide Federal contributions and authorize payroll deductions for prepaid health insurance for Federal employees and their dependents; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 8587
18. PROPERTY; PEANUTS; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported the following bills: p. D544
H.R. 8030, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to provide that acreage placed in the soil bank shall be counted as a part of total acreage for purposes of establishing future acreage allotments for the farm;
H.R. 6570, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to remove green peanuts from the marketing penalty provisions;
H.R. 6764, to amend the act of June 24, 1936, so as to delete the requirement for reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines;
H.R. 2259, to provide for the conveyance of a small tract of FHA land in Prairie Co., Ark., to private individuals.
19. FLOOD CONTROL. Reps. Rogers, Mass., and Philbin urged additional funds for flood control measures on the Merrimack River in New England. pp. 8582-83
20. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Tollefson criticized the action of the State Department in announcing "that public hearings will be held on June 18, by the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to freezing for an unspecified period the United States right to modify or withdraw tariff concessions made in conjunction with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, except under certain conditions." p. 8584
Received a Calif. Legislature memorial favoring controls on the import of dried figs and fig paste. p. 8588

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Johnson inserted an editorial discussing water problems and stating that the prevention of siltation of lakes is a serious problem and that it involves wide-spread soil conservation practices. p. A4808
22. LIBRARY SERVICES. Sen. Church spoke in favor of the \$5 million appropriated for the grants-in-aid for the rural library services, and inserted a letter describing plans that are being made in Idaho to implement this program. p. A4808
23. PERSONNEL; EXTENSION SERVICE. Rep. Cooley commended this Department for bestowing Superior Service awards to David S. Weaver, Ext. Service, Raleigh, N. C., and Horace D. Godfrey, ASC, Raleigh, N. C.. p. A4814
24. FORESTRY; SOIL BANK. Rep. Sikes spoke in favor of the tree-planting program under the soil bank, stressed the need for the \$5 million for nursery operation and development, and stated there is justification for the funds that have been requested. pp. A4816-7

25. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Vursell inserted an editorial, "Agricultural Revolt Brewing in Congress," covering a statement by the Secretary on the farm problem. p. A4823

Rep. Teague inserted an editorial, "The Unmentioned Famous Letter of Benson to Ellender," and stated that "'because some people consider this letter one of the most unusual and important pronouncements to be made by a Secretary of Agriculture in the last 25 years,' I am having this inserted." pp. A4828-9

26. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Rogers inserted her testimony before the Appropriations Committee on the Merrimack River flood-control project, also a letter from the Corps of Engineers. pp. A4825-7

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. PERSONNEL. S. 2317, by Sen. Clark, to establish a commission to study and revise the present compensation system for civilian salaried employees of the Federal Government, to amend the compensation schedule of the Classification Act of 1949; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Remarks of author. pp. S444-5

H.R. 8227, by Rep. Porter, to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

28. COTTON. H.R. 3222, by Rep. Hagen, to provide an alternative acreage adjustment and price support program for the 1958 crop of cotton; to Agriculture Committee.

PRINTED HEARINGS RECEIVED IN THIS OFFICE

29. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H.R. 1905, and other bills to extend Public Law 480 for two years and authorize barter transactions with satellite countries. House Agriculture Committee.

30. NOMINATIONS; FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Nomination of Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

31. FOREIGN AID. Foreign Policy and Mutual Security. (Bound with H. Rept. 551.) House Foreign Affairs Committee.

- 0 -

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS:

June 19: Establishing wilderness preservation system, S. Interior (McArdle to testify). Codification of census laws, H. Post Office and Civil Service (R. K. Smith, AMS, to testify). Exemption from quotas of certain wheat used on farm where produced, H. Agriculture (Berger, CSS, to testify). Mutual security authorization bill, H. Foreign Affairs (exec). Foreign aid appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec). Federal employee pay bills, H. Post Office and Civil Service.

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KEENEY] and is therefore senior. Under the rules and precedents of the House, the Chair therefore must recognize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POFF moves to recommit the bill H. R. 6127 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back forthwith the following amendment: Page 10, line 5, after the word "order" strike out the period, insert a semicolon and add the following: "Provided, That in all cases of contempt arising under the laws of the United States governing the issuance of injunctions or restraining orders in any action or proceeding instituted under this act, and the act or thing done or omitted also constitutes a criminal offense under any Act of Congress, or under the laws of any State in which it was done or omitted, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed."

"This proviso shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the wording of the motion to recommit is not germane to the bill. We have already debated the germaneness of the wording of this motion in Committee of the Whole. But, I have this additional observation to make, which was not made, as I recall, during the debate, namely, that this proposed amendment is to the act, where as it is inserted as an amendment to a section of the act. It is sought to insert this in part III of the bill only at page 10, line 5, but it purports to be an amendment to the entire act. We had a similar situation presented in the Committee in the consideration of this matter and the Chair ruled in Committee that because the wording was an amendment to the section, but was worded as an amendment to the act, that it was not germane. I urge that if the amendment were to the act, as it purports to be, it would have to be at some other point in the bill and could not be an amendment to the act in the middle of one of the sections of the act.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

This same question was raised in the Committee of the Whole on the same amendment. The very capable gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, overruled the point of order after having heard all the debate. The present occupant of the Chair, having read all of the debate and having heard most of it, reaffirms the decision of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole in the consideration of the bill and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. CHILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 251, answered "present" 6, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—158

Abbutt	Gary	O'Hara, Minn.
Abernethy	Gathings	Passman
Adair	Grant	Patman
Albert	Gregory	Perkins
Alexander	Gross	Pilcher
Alger	Gwinn	Pillion
Andersen,	Haley	Poage
H. Carl	Hardy	Poff
Andresen,	Harris	Polk
August H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Preston
Andrews	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Ashmore	Hays, Ark.	Ray
Barden	Hébert	Rees, Kans.
Bass, Tenn.	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Beckworth	Herlong	Riley
Bennett, Fla.	Hiestand	Rivers
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman	Roberts
Blitch	Huddleston	Robeson, Va.
Boggs	Hull	Robson, Ky.
Bonner	Hyde	Rogers, Fla.
Bow	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Boykin	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Bray	Jennings	Rutherford
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Scott, N. C.
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Selden
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Shuford
Broxhill	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Budge	Jones, Mo.	Siler
Burleson	Keeney	Smith, Kans.
Byrd	Kilburn	Smith, Miss.
Chelf	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Kilgore	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Kitchin	Spence
Cole	Knox	Taber
Colmer	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Lanham	Thomas
Cooper	Lennon	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Long	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Loser	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	McMullan	Trimble
Devereux	Mahon	Tuck
Dies	Marshall	Van Pelt
Dorn, S. C.	Mason	Vinson
Dowdy	Matthews	Watts
Durham	Miller, Nebr.	Weaver
Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.	Whitener
Elliott	Mills	Whitten
Evins	Morris	Williams, Miss.
Fascell	Morrison	Willis
Fisher	Moulder	Winstead
Flynt	Natcher	Wright
Forrester	Neal	Young
Fountain	Nicholson	
Frazier	Norrell	

NAYS—251

Addonizio	Canfield	Donohue
Allen, Calif.	Cannon	Dooley
Allen, Ill.	Cannahan	Dorn, N. Y.
Anderson,	Carrigg	Doyle
Mont.	Cederberg	Dwyer
Anfuso	Celler	Eberhart
Arends	Chamberlain	Engle
Ashley	Chiperfield	Fallon
Aspinall	Christopher	Farbstein
Auchincloss	Chudoff	Feighan
Avery	Church	Fenton
Ayres	Clark	Fino
Baldwin	Coad	Flood
Baring	Coffin	Fogarty
Barrett	Collier	Forand
Bass, N. H.	Corbett	Ford
Bates	Coudert	Frelinghuysen
Baumhart	Cretella	Friedel
Becker	Cunningham,	Fulton
Belcher	Iowa	Garmatz
Betts	Cunningham,	Gavin
Blatnik	Nebr.	George
Boland	Curtin	Gordon
Bolling	Curtis, Mass.	Granahan
Bolton	Curtis, Mo.	Gray
Boesch	Dague	Green, Oreg.
Boyle	Dawson, Ill.	Green, Pa.
Breeding	Dawson, Utah	Griffiths
Broomfield	Delaney	Gubser
Brown, Mo.	Dellay	Hagen
Brown, Ohio	Dempsey	Hale
Brownson	Dennison	Halleck
Buckley	Denton	Harden
Burdick	Derounian	Harvey
Bush	Diggs	Haskell
Byrne, Ill.	Dingell	Hays, Ohio
Byrne, Pa.	Dixon	Healey
Byrnes, Wis.	Dollinger	Henderson

Heselton	Martin	Saylor
Hill	May	Schenck
Hoeven	Meador	Schwengel
Holifield	Marrow	Scott, Pa.
Holland	Metcalf	Scrivner
Holmes	Michel	Scudder
Holt	Miller, Calif.	Seely-Brown
Horan	Minshall	Sheehan
Hosmer	Montoya	Shelley
James	Moore	Sheppard
Jenkins	Morano	Sieminski
Johnson	Morgan	Simpson, Pa.
Judd	Moss	Sisk
Karsten	Multer	Smith, Calif.
Kearney	Mumma	Springer
Kearns	Nimtz	Staggers
Keating	Norblad	Stauffer
Kee	O'Brien, Ill.	Sullivan
Kelley, Pa.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Talle
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Hara, Ill.	Taylor
Keogh	O'Konski	Teague, Calif.
King	O'Neill	Teller
Kirwan	Osmers	Tewes
Kluczynski	Ostertag	Thompson, N. J.
Knutson	Patterson	Thomson, Wyo.
Krueger	Pelly	Tollefson
Laird	Pfost	Udall
Lane	Philbin	Ullman
Lankford	Porter	Vanik
Latham	Powell	Van Zandt
LeCompte	Price	Vorys
Lesinski	Prouty	Vursell
Lipscomb	Rabaut	Wainwright
McCarthy	Radwan	Westland
McCormack	Reece, Tenn.	Wharton
McCulloch	Reed	Widnall
McDonough	Reuss	Wier
McFall	Rhodes, Pa.	Wigglesworth
McGregor	Riehlman	Wilson, Calif.
McIntire	Rodino	Wilson, Ind.
McVey	Rogers, Colo.	Withrow
Macdonald	Rooney	Wolverton
Mack, Ill.	Roosevelt	Yates
Mack, Wash.	Sadlak	Younger
Madden	Santangelo	Zablocki
Magnuson	St. George	Zelenko
Mailhard	Saund	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Berry	Jackson	Steed
Hess	Miller, Md.	Utt

NOT VOTING—18

Bailey	Hillings	Machrowicz
Baker	Holtzman	Murray
Beamer	Kean	Scherer
Bentley	McConnell	Simpson, Ill.
Bowler	McGovern	Walter
Griffin	McIntosh	Williams, N. Y.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Kean against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Hillings against.
Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.
Mr. Murray for, with Mr. Holtzman against.
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.
Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Beamer against.
Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Simpson of Illinois against.
Mr. Miller of Maryland for, with Mr. McConnell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. McGovern with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. McIntosh.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MACHROWICZ. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. WILLIAMS. I voted "yea." If he were present he would have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California,

Mr. HILLINGS. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BEAMER. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SIMPSON. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. McCONNELL. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. My inquiry is this, Mr. Speaker: Can the Speaker inform the House when the bill will be messaged to the Senate after the passage of the measure?

The SPEAKER. That is a question the Chair had put to him today in a press conference, and he did not enjoy any part of it. This bill is going to take the same course as every other bill that is passed. Any suggestion from any source that it might be held up is utterly unjustified.

Mr. KEATING. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Does the bill in its ordinary course go to the Senate on the same day it is passed?

The SPEAKER. If it is engrossed it does.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 126, answered "present" 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—286

Adair	Becker	Byrnes, Wis.
Addonizio	Belcher	Canfield
Allen, Calif.	Berry	Cannon
Allen, Ill.	Betts	Carnahan
Andersen,	Biatnik	Carrigg
H. Carl	Boland	Cederberg
Anderson,	Bolling	Celler
Mont.	Bolton	Chamberlain
Andresen,	Bosch	Chenoweth
August H.	Bow	Chlperfield
Anfuso	Boyle	Christopher
Arends	Bray	Chudoff
Ashley	Breeding	Church
Aspinall	Broomfield	Clark
Auchincloss	Brown, Mo.	Coad
Avery	Brown, Ohio	Coffin
Ayres	Brownson	Cole
Baldwin	Buckley	Collier
Baring	Burdick	Corbett
Barrett	Bush	Coudert
Bass, N. H.	Byrd	Cretella
Bates	Byrne, Ill.	Cunningham,
Baunhart	Byrne, Pa.	Iowa

Cunningham,	Jenkins
Nebr.	Johnson
Curtin	Judd
Curtis, Mass.	Karsten
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney
Dague	Kearns
Dawson, Ill.	Keating
Dawson, Utah	Kee
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.
Dellay	Kelly, N. Y.
Dempsey	Keogh
Dennison	King
Denton	Kirwan
Derounian	Kluczynski
Devereux	Knox
Diggs	Knutson
Dingell	Krueger
Dixon	Laird
Dollinger	Lane
Donohue	Lankford
Dooiey	Latham
Dorn, N. Y.	LeCompte
Doyle	Lesinski
Dwyer	Lipscomb
Eberharter	McCarthy
Edmondson	McCormack
Engle	McCulloch
Fallon	McDonough
Farbstein	McFall
Feighan	McGregor
Fenton	McIntire
Fine	McVey
Flood	Macdonald
Fogarty	Mack, Ill.
Forand	Mack, Wash.
Ford	Madden
Frelinghuysen	Magnuson
Friedel	Malillard
Fulton	Marshall
Garmatz	Martin
Gavin	May
George	Meader
Gordon	Merrrow
Granahan	Metcalf
Gray	Michel
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
Green, Pa.	Miller, Md.
Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Gubser	Miller, N. Y.
Gwinn	Minshall
Hagen	Montoya
Hale	Moore
Halleck	Morano
Harden	Morgan
Harrison, Nebr.	Moss
Harvey	Moulder
Haskell	Multer
Hays, Ohio	Mumma
Healey	Neal
Henderson	Nicholson
Heseltan	Ninatz
Hess	Notblad
Hlestand	O'Brien, Ill.
Hill	O'Brien, N. Y.
Hoeven	O'Hara, Ill.
Hollifield	O'Konski
Holland	O'Neill
Holmes	Osmers
Holt	Ostertag
Horan	Patterson
Hosmer	Pelly
Hyde	Perkins
Jackson	Probst
James	Philbin

NAYS—126

Abbitt	Davis, Tenn.
Abernethy	Dies
Albert	Dorn, S. C.
Alexander	Dowdy
Alger	Durham
Andrews	Elliott
Ashmore	Evins
Barden	Fascell
Bass, Tenn.	Fisher
Beckworth	Flynt
Bennett, Fla.	Forrester
Bennett, Mich.	Fountain
Blitch	Frazier
Boggs	Gary
Bonner	Gathings
Boykin	Grant
Brooks, La.	Gregory
Brooks, Tex.	Gross
Brown, Ga.	Haley
Broyhill	Hardy
Budge	Harris
Burleson	Harrison, Va.
Chelf	Hays, Ark.
Clevenger	Hébert
Colmer	Hemphill
Cooley	Herlong
Cooper	Hoffman
Cramer	Huddleston
Davis, Ga.	Hull

Pillion	Pilcher
Polk	Poage
Porter	Poff
Powell	Preston
Price	Rains
Prouty	Ray
Rabaut	Riley
Radwan	Rivers
Reece, Tenn.	Roberts
Reed	Robeson, Va.
Rees, Kans.	Rogers, Fla.
Reuss	Rogers, Tex.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Rutherford
Rhodes, Pa.	
Riehlman	
Robison, Ky.	
Rodino	
Rogers, Colo.	
Rogers, Mass.	
Rooney	
Roosevelt	
Sadlak	
Santangelo	
St. George	
Saund	
Saylor	
Schenck	
Schwengel	
Scott, Pa.	
Sclvrner	
Scudder	
Seely-Brown	
Sheehan	
Sheiley	
Sheppard	
Sleminski	
Siler	
Simpson, Pa.	
Sisk	
Smith, Calif.	
Springer	
Staggers	
Stauffer	
Sullivan	
Talle	
Taylor	
Teague, Calif.	
Teller	
Tewes	
Thompson, N. J.	
Thomson, Wyo.	
Tollefson	
Udall	
Ullman	
Vanik	
Van Pelt	
Van Zandt	
Vorys	
Vursell	
Wainwright	
Weaver	
Westland	
Wharton	
Wldnall	
Wler	
Wigglesworth	
Wilson, Calif.	
Willson, Ind.	
Withrow	
Wolverton	
Yates	
Younger	
Zablocki	
Zelenko	

Pilcher
Poage
Poff
Preston
Rains
Ray
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford

Scott, N. C.
Selden
Shuford
Sikes
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Taber
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.

Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tuck
Vinson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Steed Utt

NOT VOTING—19

Bailey
Baker
Beamer
Bentley
Bowler
Griffin
Hillings

Holtzman
Jensen
Kean
McConnell
McGovern
McIntosh
Machrowicz

Murray
Scherer
Simpson, Ill.
Walter
Williams, N. Y.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Baker against.
Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Utt against.
Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Stead against.
Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Murray against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Walter with Mr. McIntosh.
Mr. McGovern with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MACHROWICZ. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. HILLINGS. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FOGARTY, LANHAM, DENTON, CANNON, TABER, and LAIRD.

WAIVING PROVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 274) to waive the provision of section

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 26, 1957
For actions of June 25, 1957
85th-1st, No. 110

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations.....10	Foreign aid.....6	Poultry.....15
Appropriations.....4,10,11	Lands.....2	Price supports.....5
Atomic energy.....9	Legislative program.....10	Recreation.....2
Cotton.....14,19	Loans.....3	Security.....7
Electrification.....16	farm.....20	Small business.....3
Federal-State relations..8	Livestock.....15	Statehood.....1
Forestry.....2,22	Marketing.....23	St. Lawrence Seaway....13
Foreign affairs.....12	Organization.....21	Watersheds.....3
	Personnel.....7,18	Weather.....17

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to make Small Business Administration permanent agency. House committee reported Alaska statehood bill. House received conference report on Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House received USDA proposed bill to provide for commodity loans without equity payments.

HOUSE

1. STATEHOOD. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H.R. 7999, to provide statehood for Alaska (H. Rept. 624). pp. 9159, 9215
2. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H.R. 3358, to supplement the land grant provisions of the Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act to permit the selection of certain public lands in Alaska (H. Rept. 633); and H.R. 7864, to amend the Act of May 4, 1956 relative to the establishment of public recreational facilities in Alaska (H. Rept. 634). p. 9215
3. SMALL BUSINESS. Passed, 392 to 2, with amendment H.R. 7963, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency. (pp. 9161-64, 9166-9214, 9205-06). Rep. Patman offered, but later withdrew, an amendment which would have authorized SBA to make loans for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (pp. 9200-01). For a summary of the provisions of the bill see Digest 104.
4. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill of 1958 (H. Rept. 636). pp. 9164-66, 9215

5. PRICE SUPPORTS. Received from this Department a proposed bill to authorize the CCC to acquire title to unredeemed loan collateral without obligation to make equity payments; to Agriculture Committee. p. 9215
6. FOREIGN AID. Received a GAO report on the examination of the U.S. assistance program for Korea as administered by the International Cooperation Administration and the Foreign Operations Administration from 1954 through 1956. p. 9215
7. PERSONNEL. Rep. Rees spoke in favor of his bill, H.R. 8323, to establish a central Security Office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel, loyalty, and security programs, and to prescribe administrative procedures for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs. p. 9215
8. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. Several Reps. commended the President's statement before the Governor's Conference on Federal-State relationships, and discussed possibilities of returning more Federal responsibilities to the States. pp. 9208-13
9. ATOMIC ENERGY. The "Daily Digest" states as follows: "The Digest of June 24 under 'Suspension Passages' incorrectly showed S. 2243, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 regarding authorization of appropriations, as being returned to the Senate. The bill was cleared for Presidential action by House passage without amendment." p. D574
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill will be considered Wed., June 26; Rep. Andersen stated that the conferees on the Agricultural appropriation bill would meet Thurs., June 27, and he hoped that agreement could be reached and the report could be considered by the House on Fri., June 28. pp. 9204-05

SENATE

11. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee ordered reported to the full Appropriations Committee H.R. 7599, the legislative appropriation bill for 1958. p. D572
12. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Foreign Relations Committee ordered reported without amendment S. 603, to require that all international agreements other than treaties be transmitted to the Senate within 60 days of execution. p. D572
13. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. The Foreign Relations Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 1174, to increase the borrowing authority and defer the payment of interest on borrowings of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation. p. D572

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. COTTON. Rep. Lane inserted the vote of the board of directors of the Northern Textile Ass'n calling for a one-price system for cotton, "without any processing tax or similar device." pp. A5057-8
15. LIVESTOCK. Rep. Dorn spoke in favor of his bill to promote the development and use of improved methods for the humane handling, transporting, and slaughtering of livestock and poultry in interstate and foreign commerce. p. A5073
16. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Ullman inserted an editorial which carries the text of a letter written to the editor by Sen. Kefauver, "Light on Hells Canyon." pp. 5079-80

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

JUNE 25, 1957.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. FOGARTY, from the committee of conference, submitted the
following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6287]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 33, 42, 43, and 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 28, 38, 40 and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: *, of which not more than \$180,000 shall be for international labor affairs*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,121,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: , *together with not to exceed \$200,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,958,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$259,814,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$50,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *purchase of not to exceed fifty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$40,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$56,402,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$39,217,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$35,936,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$20,385,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$21,387,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 37, 39, 44, 46, and 47.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
EDWARD J. THYE,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
CHARLES POTTER,
IRVING M. IVES,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1—*Salaries and expenses*: Inserts limitation of \$180,000 on the amount which may be used for international labor affairs instead of the limitation of \$170,000 proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—*Salaries and expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 3—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,121,000 instead of \$2,021,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,191,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$200,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, instead of \$365,000 as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Amendment No. 5—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$5,958,000 instead of \$5,558,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—*Salaries and expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7—*Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration*: Appropriates \$259,814,000 instead of \$249,814,000 as proposed by the House and \$260,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—*Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9—*Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program*: Appropriates \$2,250,000 instead of \$2,236,200 as proposed by the House and \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Amendment No. 10—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$7,200,000 instead of \$7,124,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 11—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 89 passenger motor vehicles of which 51 shall be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—*Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and other services*: Authorizes not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16—*Promotion and further development of vocational education*: Appropriate \$33,750,081 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$33,442,081 as proposed by the House and insert language proposed by the Senate to provide that \$80,000 of the increase of the Senate shall apply to vocational education in Guam and \$228,000 of the increase shall be applied to vocational education in the fishery trades.

Amendment No. 17—*Promotion and further development of vocational education*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18—*Grants for library services*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19—*President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School*: Appropriates \$50,000 instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 20—*Assistance to States, general*: Appropriates \$22,592,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$19,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21—*Communicable diseases*: Appropriates \$6,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22—*Grants for waste treatment works construction*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23—*Surveys and planning for hospital construction*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24—*Hospitals and medical care*: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to provide that \$1,186,000 of the funds appropriated may be used only for payments for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act.

Amendment No. 25—*Indian health activities*: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 50 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only instead of 75 passenger motor vehicles of which 50 would be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—*Indian health activities*: Appropriates \$40,100,000 instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$42,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$100,000 over the amount proposed by the House is for an increased enrollment of 50 Indian students in practical nursing.

Amendment No. 27—*National Institutes of Health, general research and services*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 28—*National Institutes of Health, general research and services*: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—*National Institutes of Health management fund*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 30—*National Cancer Institute*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 31—*National Cancer Institute*: Appropriates \$56,402,000 instead of \$46,902,000 as proposed by the House and \$58,543,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—*Mental health activities*: Appropriates \$39,217,000 instead of \$35,217,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,421,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—*Mental health activities*: Strikes language proposed by the Senate to make available in 1958 not to exceed \$4,573,000 of the unobligated balance of the fiscal year 1957 appropriation granted under this head.

Amendment No. 34—*National Heart Institute*: Appropriates \$35,936,000 instead of \$33,436,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,784,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35—*Arthritis and metabolic disease activities*: Appropriates \$20,385,000 instead of \$17,885,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,548,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36—*Neurology and blindness activities*: Appropriates \$21,387,000 instead of \$18,887,000 as proposed by the House and \$24,058,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—*Retired pay of commissioned officers*: Reported in disagreement.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 38—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$3,085,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 39—*Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40—*Grants to States for public assistance*: Strikes language of the House limiting the use of funds for administrative expenses of State and local agencies as proposed by the Senate. The majority of the managers on the part of the House are still convinced that some action should be taken to curb the ever-increasing costs of administering this program. The House Committee on Appropriations in its Report No. 24 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, stated as follows:

The committee has been disturbed at the large increases that occur every year in the cost of administration. In 1950

these costs were \$57,281,000 and they have increased substantially every year since. They are estimated to be \$101,000,000 during the current fiscal year (1957) if no special restrictions are imposed. This would be an increase of 75 percent since 1950 while the caseload under the public assistance programs has increased less than 3 percent.

The managers on the part of the House receded from disagreement to the amendment of the Senate only after being assured by the Commissioner of Social Security that a very thorough study will be made of this problem and appropriate action will be taken to assure that no more funds will be expended than are necessary for the efficient administration of the public assistance programs. The House Committee on Appropriations will expect a full report on this matter in time for hearings on the 1959 budget request.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 41—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel*: Appropriates \$449,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$425,000 as proposed by the House. Inasmuch as these funds are to be derived by transfer from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, it will be expected that they be applied solely for legal work in connection with operations under that fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 42: Inserts language proposed by the House to limit payments for indirect expenses in connection with research projects to 15 percent of the direct costs which was stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Reinstates section number revised by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45: Reinstates section number revised by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 47—*Salaries and expenses*: Reported in disagreement.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

opportunity of all persons to complete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields.

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1944, as amended (15 U. S. C. 13 (b)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, in any section of the country, it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor: *Provided further,* That nothing contained herein shall be construed to alter the law applicable to the absorption of freight or of shipping charges."

Please notice the last provision. It represents my views. The only time freight absorption is interfered with is when it is used for the purpose of price discrimination; that is by giving one merchant an advantage by paying his freight but refusing to pay the freight of his competitor across the street. As long as all competing customers are treated alike the law is not violated.

What does it do? It will really help the little man. It passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 393 to 3 a year ago. But, now it is being opposed by the big man. So the test will come. Here is a bill that will help little business which is now opposed by big business. Which side are we going to take? It is not often that we have a bill where there is a conflict of interest, but there is a bill here now. So this bill merely provides just exactly the same as we have provided with reference to railroad freight rates. Suppose a railroad were giving special discounts to certain shippers. You would not like it. The people of this Nation did not like it more than 70 years ago and they passed the Interstate Commerce Act. The Interstate Commerce Act says that whenever you ship over a railroad, you pay the same price per car and the same price per 100 pounds as anybody else pays. There is no discrimination. It provides that the carload rate will be the maximum discount on freight rates. Everybody is treated exactly alike. That is what the Robinson-Patman law is. It says to the big manufacturer who is selling to the retail stores in your hometown that they shall treat everybody alike. That is all in the world that it does. It says, "Mr. Manufacturer, when you come to my hometown and you have two representatives or outlets there in stores across the street from each other, and

one of them is a big interstate chain which has stores all over the Nation and the other one is owned by local people we want them treated in exactly the same way on prices they pay for their merchandise that you treat the interstate chain on the basis of the same facts and circumstances. We are willing for you to make a difference in the price where there is a difference in the quantity or there is a difference in the cost of manufacture or a difference in the cost of delivery—that is perfectly all right. But do not discriminate against our hometown man and give the other person an advantage over him, which is not justified by any difference in cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery." That is the Golden Rule. That is nothing but the Golden Rule. How can you fight the Golden Rule? Suppose the Post Office Department was discriminating against people in the delivery of the mail? You would not like that. That bill is just a bill to prohibit discrimination against the little man. It is not a bill to give him an advantage or an unfair advantage or an unequal opportunity.

It is a bill guaranteeing equality of opportunity, and that is exactly all there is to it. The big man says they do not want it. Why? All of them are not that way; most of them want the law. Most people want it because it protects them against the chiseler.

A lot of the big people complain that the chiselers make them, compel them, to give discounts they do not want to give. This law protects them from it, and they thank Congress for passing the law. It helps them.

CHISELERS, CHEATERS, AND RACKETEERS

But there are certain people who like to be chiselers—there are not many; there are just a few—chiselers, cheaters, racketeers. They do not like the Golden Rule bill. They want the privilege of making discounts and unearned allowances, under-the-table settlements, and dishonest money passing. There are not many of them, but remember this, Mr. Speaker, that laws are made for the exceptions; they are not made for the general rule.

The general rule of people are law-abiding people. You do not need laws for most of them; you pass laws only for the exceptions, and the exceptions among the big-business people who are manufacturers and sellers to the hometown merchants, the exceptions are some cheaters, some chiselers, and a few racketeers—not many, just a few, but enough to destroy many small-business people, and that bill will help them more than anything else.

HIGH INTEREST CAUSES INFLATION

Another thing that small-business people need is a relief in taxes, and I could mention other things, but the worst thing that is hitting all America today is high interest. High interest causes high cost; high cost causes high prices; high prices cause high inflation.

I wish we had here a committee that would take it upon itself to investigate this problem and not say that the lender is so sacrosanct that we cannot even call his name, that interest is such a

sacred word that we cannot mention interest. I wish we had an investigation made by people who are not timid here in this House, who are not shy, and who are willing to call a spade a spade, and who are willing to point their fingers at the people who are actually causing the inflation by causing higher and higher interest rates.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the speech just made by my very eminent and highly respected friend, I think some answer should be made in the way of a review of the history of this thing. It is familiar to some of the Members, but it might possibly be new to others, especially the newer Members.

Seventeen or eighteen years ago, after the outbreak of hostilities in Europe it became apparent that the impact of an increasing defense effort was jeopardizing the small business of this country.

At the time, and I think it was 1939, our minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, who was then minority leader, created a Small Business Committee. It was a Republican Small Business Committee. He made me chairman of that committee. We undertook to hold some hearings around the country. They were very illuminating, and, I think, very helpful. They attracted a lot of interest. After that time the gentleman from Texas introduced a resolution for the creation of an official Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives. That resolution was adopted and the committee was created.

He became the chairman of that committee and I became the ranking Republican member of the committee. I served in that position until I became majority leader of the 80th Congress, at which time I relinquished my membership on that committee.

May I say that throughout the years we did things that were useful for small business. Sometimes I disagreed with my chairman [Mr. PATMAN]. On many things we did agree. He has mentioned one thing here that I would like to discuss briefly. He has mentioned the bill, S. 11. He speaks of it in connection with the Robinson-Patman Act. You are undoubtedly getting a lot of communications with reference to S. 11 and this bill. I supported the Robinson-Patman Act. I was here when it was written into law. I think that these unfair discriminations in respect to prices among distributors should be prohibited. But the gentleman from Texas has had something else he consistently adds to that, sometimes out in the open and sometimes where you cannot see it so clearly.

If I understood him correctly, through the years he has been very much of an advocate of the abolition of so-called freight absorption. To explain, many manufacturers in this country have a policy of quoting a delivered price and they adjust that out of the freight. That is, they absorb the freight charges. Let me show you how it works. You talk about what favors the big man and you

talk about what favors the small man. Here is a big soap company with manufacturing plants all over the United States. They are producing in the consuming area, their freight charges are not high. But here is one little soap company that is located in your hometown or my hometown. It advertises nationally, it sells all over the country. Why, they cannot sell a bar of soap in one place for 15 cents and in another place for a dime. In order to compete with the big company they have to be permitted to absorb freight. The whole economy of this country has been built on that sort of program. I say when we begin to tinker with that we tinker with something that is a very delicate matter.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. May I urge the gentleman to consider the bill that is pending. S. 11 does have a specific provision against anything that interferes with the basing point system. The gentleman is clearly wrong about that, I will say to him. This does not affect it, and I am opposed to that, like the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I well recall when we were having those recurring fights over the so-called basing point system that the gentleman was an open advocate of the elimination of freight absorptions; is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Only where it involved price discrimination, where they were using it as a means to discriminate against a local merchant. I am against that when it is used as a means for discriminating in price.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has said the chamber of commerce is always on the side of the big fellows. There are chambers of commerce in Lafayette, in Valparaiso, in Warsaw, Ind., all in my district. There are a few big concerns with plants in 1 or 2 of those towns, but the 800 or 900 members of the Chamber of Commerce of Lafayette, Ind., are not big-business people. They have their choice. So let us keep this thing where it ought to be. I did not get permission to speak out of order, and the gentleman from Texas did not get permission to speak out of order, but S. 11 has nothing to do with the measure that is before us.

Mr. PATMAN. I will state it does have something to do with it because it involves small business.

Mr. HALLECK. We are setting up here a Government agency. The gentleman objects to it because it is a permanent agency.

I would like to recount a little more history with the gentleman on that very point. He will recall with me that when we established the Small Business Committee we saw that shortages of material were handicapping small business. These firms were not getting the part of the defense effort they should have had. So we decided something ought to be done. I have heard the gentleman say a hundred times, and I have said it myself, that the big fellows have their people in Washington to plead their case.

The small-business man generally cannot do that.

What did we do, I ask the gentleman from Texas? We set up a separate small-business operation, the Small Defense Plants Corp. Then we had a Smaller War Plants Corp.

Mr. PATMAN. The Smaller War Plants was the first one.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me remind the gentleman from Texas I stood with him at that time and I have not changed my mind since. I might also say to him that there have been some vigorous arguments about it in some places.

But I thought that we needed a separate organization to avoid what otherwise might be the domination of the very interests that you seem to fear.

Now, there have been contentions lately that the present small business organizations should be merged in the Department of Commerce. There are many responsible people who urge that there should be no duplication; that everybody should be treated alike in the one department. Personally, I have opposed that because I believe there is a place for this kind of small business organization.

Now, you can see from that, and the fact that the gentleman from Texas through the years stood with me on that proposition, or I stood with him—let us put it the other way around—I am nothing less than astounded that he would now come in here, when it was sought to set this organization up on a permanent basis, recognizing, of course, that at any time the Congress wants to terminate it, it could terminate it—but to find some sort of a question why he cannot go along with this legislation.

Now, I say in all frankness that it would seem to me that he was seeking to read a very definite implication that somehow or other since President Eisenhower has been in office and for 2 years the Republicans had control of the Congress—that somehow or other that bodes ill for small business. I just do not happen to feel that it does. So, feeling that way about it, I do not see why there should be any reason why this should not be made permanent because, again, let me remind the Members of the House that through the years back there long before this administration ever came into power, when I am sure we had administrations that the gentleman from Texas would argue were all for small business, we found it necessary not only to enact specific legislation but to continue the establishment of a special small business corporation to look after the interests of small business. So, why now confuse the issue? Why not go along with this program that I say is a sound one. Here is a chance to prove whether or not you are on the side of small business. Here is a chance to say to small business, "We think you ought to have special consideration. We are going to see to it that you have it so far as it is within our power to see that you get it." And I might say if the \$250,000 is not enough for the loan maximum, why it is perfectly simple to offer an amendment to increase it, and I am not so sure that I

would not go along with it. But somewhere there comes a line that we have to draw.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I expect to offer an amendment to take the limit off, just like it is on all other concerns.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I do not think I would buy that one. I do not think I would go sled length on that. Frankly, I will say to the gentleman, in my State there is a great automobile corporation, Studebaker, which has been in existence for a long time, now teamed up with Packard. I want them to get along; I want them to do well, and I hope they will survive in the competition with others. I do not know whether you would have this corporation loan them enough money to insure their staying in the picture or not, I do not know. But I say that somewhere you have to draw the line, and I say it is high time we make it clear that we are in favor of small business, and I think this legislation is one place where, by staying with it, you can establish that very fact.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Bailey	Cooley	McConnell
Barden	Dawson, Ill.	May
Beamer	Grant	Norrell
Blich	Gray	Powell
Bonner	Griffiths	Roosevelt
Bowler	Holifield	Shelley
Boykin	Holtzman	Taylor
Brownson	Kearney	Vursell
Buckley	Kirwan	Wilson, Ind.
Christopher	Krueger	
Conner	Lipscomb	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 398 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H. R. 6287, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 636)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 33, 42, 43, and 45.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 28, 33, 40 and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which not more than \$180,000 shall be for international labor affairs"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,121,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "together with not to exceed \$200,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,958,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$259,814,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "purchase of not to exceed fifty passenger motor ve-

hicles for replacement only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$40,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,402,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$39,217,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,936,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,387,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 37, 39, 44, 46, and 47.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
EDWARD J. THYE,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
CHARLES POTTER,
IRVING M. IVES,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Inserts limitation of \$180,000 on the amount which may be used for international labor affairs, instead of the limitation of \$170,000 proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,121,000 instead of \$2,021,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,191,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$200,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, instead of \$365,000 as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$5,958,000 instead \$5,558,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7—Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration: Appropriates \$259,814,000 instead of \$249,814,000 as proposed by the House and \$260,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: Appropriates \$2,250,000 instead of \$2,236,200 as proposed by the House and \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Amendment No. 10—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$7,200,000 instead of \$7,124,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 11—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 89 passenger motor vehicles of which 51 shall be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and other services: Authorizes not to exceed 4 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Appropriate \$33,750,081 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$33,442,081 as proposed by the House and insert language proposed by the Senate to provide that \$80,000 of the increase of the Senate shall apply to vocational education in Guam and \$228,000 of the increase shall be applied to vocational education in the fishery trades.

Amendment No. 17—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18—Grants for library services: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19—President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School: Appropriates \$50,000 instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 20—Assistance to States, General: Appropriates \$22,592,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$19,592,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21—Communicable diseases: Appropriates \$6,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22—Grants for waste treatment works construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23—Surveys and planning for hospital construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24—Hospitals and medical care: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to provide that \$1,186,000 of the funds appropriated may be used only for payments for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act.

Amendment No. 25—Indian health activities: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 50 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only instead of 75 passenger motor vehicles of which 50 would be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—Indian health activities: Appropriates \$40,100,000 instead of \$40 million as proposed by the House and \$42,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$100,000 over the amount proposed by the House is for an increased enrollment of 50 Indian students in practical nursing.

Amendment No. 27—National Institutes of Health, general research and services: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 28—National Institutes of Health, general research and services: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 8 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—National Institutes of Health management fund: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 30—National Cancer Institute: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 31—National Cancer Institute: Appropriates \$56,402,200 instead of \$46,902,000 as proposed by the House and \$58,543,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—Mental health activities: Appropriates \$56,402,000 instead of \$35,217,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,421,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—Mental health activities: Strikes language proposed by the Senate to make available in 1958 not to exceed \$4,573,000 of the unobligated balance of the fiscal year 1957 appropriation granted under this head.

Amendment No. 34—National Heart Institute: Appropriates \$35,936,000 instead of \$33,436,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,784,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35—Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: Appropriates \$20,385,000 instead of \$17,885,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,548,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36—Neurology and blindness activities: Appropriates \$21,387,000 instead of \$18,887,000 as proposed by the House and \$24,058,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—Retired pay of commissioned officers: Reported in disagreement.

St. Elizabeths Hospital

Amendment No. 38—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$3,085,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Social Security Administration

Amendment No. 39—Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40—Grants to States for public assistance: Strikes language of the House limiting the use of funds for administrative expenses of State and local agencies as proposed by the Senate. The majority of the managers on the part of the House are still convinced that some action should be taken to curb the ever-increasing costs of administering this program. The House Committee on Appropriations in its report No. 24 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, stated as follows: "The committee has been disturbed at the large increases that occur every year in the cost of administration. In 1950, these costs were \$57,281,000 and they

have increased substantially every year since. They are estimated to be \$101,000,000 during the current fiscal year (1957) if no special restrictions are imposed. This would be an increase of 75 percent since 1950, while the caseload under the public assistance programs has increased less than 3 percent." The managers on the part of the House receded from disagreement to the amendment of the Senate only after being assured by the Commissioner of Social Security that a very thorough study will be made of this problem and appropriate action will be taken to assure that no more funds will be expended than are necessary for the efficient administration of the public assistance programs. The House Committee on Appropriations will expect a full report on this matter in time for hearings on the 1959 budget request.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 41—Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: Appropriates \$449,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$425,000 as proposed by the House. Inasmuch as these funds are to be derived by transfer from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, it will be expected that they be applied solely for legal work in connection with operations under that fund.

General provisions

Amendment No. 42—Inserts language proposed by the House to limit payments for indirect expenses in connection with research projects to 15 percent of the direct costs which was stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43—Reinstates section number revised by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44—Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45—Reinstates section number revised by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46—Reported in disagreement.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 47—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7963) to amend the Small Business Act of 1958, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7963, with Mr. Boggs in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 6973 is a bill to extend the Small Business Act and to make permanent the Small Business Administration. If we are to preserve our way of life, if we are to encourage competitive independent business interests, it is essential to give some help to the small-business man. He is the backbone of our economy. He is the preserver of our liberties. Competitive small busi-

ness is an attribute of free governments.

Small business, in the broad competitive field, is at a disadvantage. There is no such permanent group in our country as small business. The small-business man of today in this land of opportunity may be the big-business man of tomorrow. I do not want to create any animosity between the small-business man and the big-business man. Every small-business man, who is a normal American, wants to become a big-business man some day; and a great many of them attain that goal. But in the process he meets many obstacles. It is the purpose of this bill to see that small business is preserved in America. I do not know any finer achievement that could be had, or anything that would inure more to the happiness of our people and the stability of our institutions than that. To paraphrase the well-known poem:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;

But a bold middle-income class, the country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

We must preserve the small-business man. We must give him some advantages in order that he may maintain his position and continue to exert his influence and strength for the benefit of his community and the welfare of all our people.

This bill gives to the small-business man help and accommodation that he otherwise could not obtain. The greatest need for the small-business man is the assurance that he can obtain sufficient finance to carry on. He is often at a disadvantage because entrenched big business is always able to obtain sufficient finances for its operation. Often the small-business man meets obstacles which he might not surmount unless there were some Government help that would tide him over his difficulty.

This bill provides for direct loans by the Small Business Administration to the small-business man. But before he can get a loan, he must prove to the Administration that he cannot obtain it from private lenders.

The bill fixes the interest rate that the Government obtains on these loans. It reduces the present maximum interest rate from 6 percent to 5 percent.

The present law also places a ceiling on the interest rate obtained by the participants. This bill places no ceiling on the interest charged by the private lenders who participate in the loans. The accepted applicant is assured of getting a loan at not more than 5 percent from the Government. If the private lender wishes to participate, the Government does not attempt to control his interest rate. This provision protects private enterprise from Government competition.

Under the present law there is established in the Small Business Administration a Policy Committee. It consists of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Commerce. This has been changed in the present bill. The committee feels that

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 27, 1957
For actions of June 26, 1957
85th-1st, No. 111

CONTENTS

Administrative procedure	54	Foreign affairs.....	22	REA loans.....	27
Advisory committees.....	3	Foreign aid.....	33,37	Reclamation.....	4,27
Appropriations.....	1,25,36,58	Forestry.....	1,58	Recreation.....	13
Audit.....	33	Housing.....	21	Research.....	15,49
Budget.....	5,43	Industrial uses.....	49	Rural telephones.....	45
Cheese.....	39	Information.....	60	Safety.....	19
Cooperatives.....	8	Insecticides.....	47	Security.....	50
Cotton.....	20,36	Interest rates.....	27,29,38	Soil erosion.....	40
Disaster relief.....	14	Lands.....	4,52	St. Lawrence Seaway...9,23	
Education.....	31,56	Legislative program....	36	Statehood.....	35
Electrification.....	27,38	Livestock.....	16	Taxation.....	8
Experiment stations.....	6	Monetary problems.....	7	Tobacco.....	12,59
Farm program.....	48	Peanuts.....	2,11	Territories.....	34
Federal aid.....	28,56,57	Personnel.....	18,44	Trade, foreign.....	10,32
Fiscal policy.....	5	Poultry.....	42	Transportation..9,23,26,46	
Flood control.....	41	Power.....	51	Tungsten.....	53
Food additives.....	55	Price supports.....	17,59	Wheat.....	30
		Purchasing.....	24		

HIGHLIGHTS: (See Page 6).

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 5189, the Interior appropriation bill for 1958, which includes Forest Service items. Senate conferees were appointed June 24.

Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 9328-33

Received conference report on H.R. 6070, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1958 (H. Rept. 648). pp. 9322-24, 9355

2. PEANUTS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H.R. 6764, to amend the act of June 24, 1936, so as to delete the requirement for reports from persons owning or operating peanut picking or threshing machines (H. Rept. 646). p. 9355

3. ADVISORY COMMITTEES. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 7390, to amend the Administrative Expense Act of 1946 so as to establish standards for certain advisory committees. pp. 9333, 9355

4. LANDS; RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment H.R. 2147, to provide for the construction by Interior of the San Angelo reclamation project, Tex., H.R. 6940, to authorize Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and H.R. 8054, to provide for the leasing of oil and gas deposits in lands beneath inland navigable waters in Alaska. p. D582

5. FISCAL POLICY. The Joint Economic Committee issued a report on fiscal policy implications of the economic outlook and budget developments (H. Rept. 647). p. 9355
6. EXPERIMENT STATIONS. Received from this Department the annual report on the State agricultural experiment stations. p. 9355
7. MONETARY PROBLEMS. Both Houses received a report on the activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (H. Doc. 200). pp. 9219, 9355
8. COOPERATIVES. Rep. Becker inserted a newspaper editorial favoring Federal income taxation on cooperative corporations in the same manner as other business corporations. p. 9328
9. TRANSPORTATION. Passed with amendment H.R. 5728, to modify the general corporate powers and utilization of funds, and increase the borrowing authority of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. pp. 9334-49
10. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Lanham criticized the foreign trade policies of the State Department. pp. 9352-53

SENATE

11. PEANUTS. Passed without amendment S. 609, to repeal the requirement for certain reports from operators of peanut picking or threshing machines. pp. 9266-7
12. TOBACCO. Passed without amendment H.R. 7259, establishing type 21 Virginia fire cured tobacco as a separate kind of tobacco for marketing quota purposes and limiting its price support level to an amount not in excess of the higher of (a) the 1957 level or (b) 90% of parity. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 9267
13. RECREATION. Passed as reported S. 846, to establish a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission of 15 members, including 8 from Congress and 7 from private life, to develop a national policy for outdoor recreation and encourage recreational uses of national resources. pp. 9270-2
14. DISASTER RELIEF. Sen. Humphrey urged disaster aid for flood-stricken areas in Minn., and inserted his letter to the Secretary, a news article, and a petition on the flood problem. pp. 9253-7
15. RESEARCH. Sen. Capehart urged more extended agricultural research and inserted two articles on the uses for farm products. pp. 9262-4
16. LIVESTOCK. The proposed amendments to S. 1356, to transfer the jurisdiction over unfair trade practices in the meatpacking industry to the FTC, offered by the American Meat Institute, were criticized by Sen. Watkins on the grounds that the Department of Agriculture never issued a cease and desist order to any packer. pp. 9309-11
17. PRICE SUPPORTS. Received from the Secretary a proposed bill to authorize CCC to acquire title to unredeemed loan collateral without obligation to make equity payments; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

ARMED FORCES MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to attend a meeting of the Armed Forces Management Association held here in Washington as a part of the association's annual national conference.

This organization, with which I had not previously been acquainted, is made up of men and women from the management and personnel fields of the armed services who have associated themselves on a completely voluntary basis for the purpose of discussing and promoting improved management policies and procedures in both the uniformed and civilian components of the Armed Forces.

I take this opportunity to commend the thousands of members of the Armed Forces Management Association for the interest in and dedication to the national welfare reflected in this volunteer activity, above and beyond the call of routine duty.

At the same time, I earnestly urge the top leadership of our Armed Forces, both civilian and military, to give substantially larger encouragement, cooperation, and support to the activities of this organization and its membership throughout the Nation.

Certainly, the activities of the association, as reflected by its recent conference agenda indicates that it has a great deal to contribute toward more economical and efficient utilization of our defense billions, and of our civilian and uniformed personnel in the Defense Establishment, and to the solution of problems created by shortages of engineers and scientists.

I bespeak the interest and support for this association and its activities of the Members of Congress and particularly those on the Committee on Armed Services and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 121 of yesterday, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate Monday afternoon July 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Adair	Dies	Montoya
Bailey	Diggs	Powell
Beamer	Engle	Saylor
Bentley	Grant	Scott, Pa.
Bowler	Gray	Shelley
Buckley	Hollifield	Springer
Celler	Holtzman	Taylor
Coffin	Horan	Wilson, Calif.
Colmer	Kearney	Zelenko
Cooley	McConnell	
Dawson, Ill.	McGregor	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 403 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE LATE BELLE S. MICHENER

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House the death of Belle S. Michener, wife of Earl C. Michener, who served the Second Congressional District of Michigan with distinction for three decades. He was my predecessor in this body.

Mrs. Michener was taken on Monday of this week and the funeral will be held in Adrian, Mich., this afternoon.

I am sure that all of my colleagues who served with Earl Michener join me in extending to him and his family our very deepest sympathy in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of serving with Earl Michener during all of the time he was a Member of this body. We were very close friends of Representative and Mrs. Michener.

Mrs. Michener was a wonderful woman and very popular here in Washington. She was very helpful to Earl Michener.

I extend the deepest sympathies of Mrs. Reed and me to Mr. Michener and their daughters in this time of their bereavement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I served with Earl Michener while he was a Member of this body. Mr. Michener was extremely helpful to me when I first came to Congress, he being chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in the 80th Congress.

I regret deeply to hear of the death of his beloved wife and join my col-

leagues in extending sympathy to him and his family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join with the gentleman from Michigan in expressing our sincere sympathy and condolence to Earl Michener at the loss of his beloved wife. I served in the Congress with Earl Michener when I first came here and I found him to be very helpful and very capable. The Congress lost one of its outstanding Members when Mr. Michener left.

I extend my sympathies to Mr. Michener and his daughters.

ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to state that I was very much in favor of the bill considered yesterday concerning small business. I was on the floor during the major part of the debate but was called away for a short time and did not return in time to answer to my name when the rollcall was had. Had I been present my vote would have been cast in support of the Small Business Act because I certainly am interested and concerned with that matter.

THE NEED FOR GREATER TRAFFIC SAFETY

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, Monday night the President, in addressing the Conference of Governors in Williamsburg, Va., turned the spotlight on a problem of constantly increasing magnitude—that of highway safety.

As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety, created out of the concern of every Member of this House for the national health and welfare of all our citizens, I have been gratified to read in the news the interest shown by many of the Governors, as well as the President, regarding the tragic toll of lives and destruction of property now being wasted upon the Nation's highways. My deepest hope is that concerted action will follow up the thoughts and concern over highway safety, now being expressed in Williamsburg.

Mr. Speaker, in his speech, the President stated:

The American people are paying an increasingly fearful price for the failure of the States to agree on such safety essentials as standards for licensing of drivers and vehicles and basic rules of the road.

I would like to point out that the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety in the interim report which it filed on January 3, 1957, just 6 months after it had been established, urged the States to adopt uniform traffic laws; the subcommittee further urged that driver examining and licensing procedures be

strengthened; and that vehicles be properly inspected. The Subcommittee on Traffic Safety recommended that more aggressive action be taken by local communities and counties as well as States. The subcommittee urged that there be organized citizen support for balanced and well-organized safety programs of responsible public officials. Certainly, it is not possible to have safety on our highways if we do not have citizens who want safety.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the President has seconded those recommendations which have been made by the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety. I sincerely hope that every public official will continue the effort to alert the public to the horrendous national waste being strewn upon our highways. The public must arm against this vicious enemy which is now taking over 40,000 lives, and leaving 100,000 permanently and totally disabled, and over 2 million casualties in its wake each year. We must all work for victory in order to conquer this tremendous national health problem, already of epidemic proportions.

TAX CO-OPS

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include an editorial.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in the Baldwin Citizen under date of June 20, 1957, there appeared an editorial entitled "Tax Co-ops," which I recommend to the attention of my colleagues.

TAX CO-OPS

Across the Nation awhile ago, 794 weekly editors took pen in hand to answer a series of 22 questions on vital issues propounded by the American Press which published the results in a recent issue of the magazine together with a letter commending the survey to the attention of Mr. Congressman for an overall picture of grassroots sentiment.

"There is no doubt among most Congressmen," said the letter, "that the country editor does reflect grassroots sentiment. Without his help, it is often difficult to know what the rural half of America is thinking."

The returns showed the editors pretty evenly divided on whether the post office should pay its way, whether military service under the draft should be shortened from 2 years to 18 months. They strongly favored increasing income-tax exemptions and reducing foreign aid, opposed Federal aid to schools.

But the one question of the 22 on which the editors were most solidly in agreement asked whether cooperative corporations and savings and loan associations (should) be subject to Federal income taxation in the same manner as other business corporations.

Of the 794 editors from every section of the country, Northeast, South, South Central, West, 86 percent replied "Yes," 12 percent answered "No" and only 2 percent ducked the question.

This resounding verdict from the opinion leaders in all parts of rural America should be reassuring to those Congressmen who have shied away from this issue with the mistaken idea that country people are solidly behind the co-ops. They may now be assured that unfairness and discrimination are repugnant to Americans whether they happen to live in the city or the country. And these lawmakers may now, without fear of disfavor or reprisal, allow their con-

sciences to guide them in taking legislative steps to end the iniquitous and socialistic tax evasion that is permitting the co-ops and savings and loan associations to grow fat and sassy at the expense of their tax-paying competitors.

AWARD OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL ORDER OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT, WITH THE RANK OF KNIGHT COMMANDER WITH STAR

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8383) to authorize the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK and the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY, Members of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Ecclesiastical Order of St. Gregory the Great, with the rank of Knight Commander with Star.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY, Representative from the State of New York, are authorized to accept the award of the Ecclesiastical Order of St. Gregory the Great, with the rank of Knight Commander with Star, together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Department of State is authorized to deliver to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK and the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY any such decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (ch. 32, 21 Stat. 604; 5 U. S. C. 114), or any other provision of law to the contrary, the named recipients may wear and display the aforementioned decoration after acceptance thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARD OF THE PHILIPPINE LEGION OF HONOR IN THE DEGREE OF COMMANDER

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8384) to authorize the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Members of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of Commander, tendered by the Republic of the Philippines.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Representative from the State of Massachusetts, are authorized to accept the award of the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of Commander, together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Department of State is authorized to deliver to

the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., any such decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (ch. 32, 21 Stat. 604; 5 U. S. C. 114), or other provision of law to the contrary, the named recipients may wear and display the aforementioned decoration after acceptance thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 25, 1957.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] is opposed to the conference report. Therefore, I yield 5 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly to have to oppose the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and to oppose this conference report. But at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to agree to Senate Amendment No. 4. I do this, Mr. Speaker, in order to preserve the sanctity of the highway trust fund created by the Highway Act of 1956.

Those of us who were present during the debate when this measure was first before the House will recall that this provision was passed over without any debate thereon. Later when it was brought to my attention that \$365,000 was appropriated out of the highway trust fund for certain functions of administration of the Department of Labor, I asked unanimous consent to go back to the item, but the gentleman from Rhode Island objected. Thereupon the measure went to the other body and the other body eliminated the item.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take just a moment to read the language of the committee report on this appropriation as reported by the other body:

The committee recommends an increase of \$170,000, the amount necessary to finance the mandatory increases.

That is for the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Labor.

The committee recommends the deletion of the proviso to make available \$365,000 by transfer from the highway trust fund for the administrative expenses of the Solicitor in making wage determinations in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act as provided in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1955.

It is the sense of the committee that the legislative history and intent in the enactment of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 did not contemplate the use of the highway trust fund for this purpose.

I think anyone who will take the trouble to read the legislative history of this act both before the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Ways and Means will agree totally and completely with this statement.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I should like to concur in what the gentleman from Louisiana is stating as far as the Committee on Public Works is concerned, because that committee never entertained the notion that there would be a severance of the activities of the Department of Labor, the payment for that activity to be accounted for through the trust fund.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I certainly yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I concur fully with the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana served as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means on the Highway Revenue Act and was the author of that act. The Committee on Ways and Means reported that act and the House passed it. The gentleman is entirely correct that the intent and purpose of the Congress was to preserve the highway trust fund for the building of highways and not deplete that fund by provisions of this type. The fact is, when the time comes to build the highways sufficient funds will not be there for that purpose and we will be called upon again to provide more revenue for the building of the highways. The gentleman from Louisiana is exactly correct in the position he is taking and I fully support him.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. REED. I have been very much interested in the Highway Revenue Act. As the gentleman knows, I offered the amendment to put the tax on the trucks in order to build up the highways of this country. The gentleman is absolutely right that we want the integrity of this trust fund preserved for the building of the roads. If we begin to use these funds for other purposes, we will destroy the fund and will not have the highways the

country needs. I congratulate the gentleman on the position he has taken.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. As one who is in favor of the Davis-Bacon Act, I am in full accord with what the gentleman says, that this should not be taken out of the highway fund.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman, and I want to make that point very clear. This is not an attack on the Davis-Bacon Act. I supported the Davis-Bacon Act, too. Actually, it weakens the act to ask for funds in this manner. That act has been on the books since 1931, over 25 years. The idea that all of a sudden we must turn to the highway trust fund to finance those provisions of the law is utterly ridiculous, as we pointed out in the debate initially on this proposal. If the Labor Department can come in and demand these funds, the Defense Department can come in, the Treasury Department can come in, and innumerable other agencies of the Government can come in who would have more claim to this money than the Labor Department.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman's motion, if he makes the motion, prevails, then is there any money at all anywhere in the bill for the performance of this function?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes; there is. I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

Mr. HALLECK. My information is to the contrary.

Mr. BOGGS. No. If I may explain, the Senate provided \$170,000. The Senate further said the current rate of expenditure is such, though, as to raise serious doubt as to the amount necessary, and the Department is directed to submit a supplemental estimate for consideration by Congress prior to July 1, 1957. That is the language of the conference report. I trust the Members will support the highway trust fund. There is no question that funds are available and further funds will be made available for the Davis-Bacon provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I made it most clear that I support Davis-Bacon. That is not the issue here. The issue is the necessity of keeping these funds for highway construction and not diverting them contrary to law.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you want to support the Davis-Bacon Act or not. But, for my part, regardless of how I might have felt when it was adopted, it was adopted and it is the law of the land. That is the issue here: Are we going to provide the money to support the Bacon-Davis Act? This is the situation. I have the highway statute in my hand and I am

going to read some of it to you. It is as follows:

Expenditures from the trust fund, Federal-aid highway program: Amounts in the trust fund shall be available as provided by appropriation acts for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations.

Section 102 of that law shows that it is an amendment and supplement of the act of July 11, 1916. Section 115 of the law provides that the Davis-Bacon Act shall be applicable to the roads that are constructed. Frankly, I am going to meet my responsibility and I am going to vote for the money to operate it. There is no question but that under section 209 of the act which I have read to you that any provision of the act of July 11, 1916, or act supplemental or amendatory thereof, shall be paid or can be paid out of the trust fund. The House committee followed the rule that was set up in section 209 of the act. They have provided \$365,000 to be derived from the act because that was the information which was presented to us. When it went to the other body, it was demonstrated that their requirements would be \$239,000. We agreed in the conference to put that thing back and meet our responsibilities and draw \$200,000 out of the highway trust fund. There is absolutely no question but what the way the act reads that we have the authority to do it and we are right in carrying it out. If we are not going to meet our responsibilities and if we want to run out on what the Congress has decided that is another question, but I am not going to be a party to that way of doing business.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will refer to the report of the other body—

Mr. TABER. Oh, I heard the gentleman read from the Senate report, but the law says something entirely different. If the gentleman would read the law, he would realize that. Shall I read it again to him?

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Shall I read it again to him?

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Let me read it once more.

Mr. BOGGS. Read it as many times as you want. The law, in my opinion, is quite clear in that these funds are only available for highway purposes—

Mr. TABER. This is the picture. The law says one thing and the gentleman wants us to do something different. I believe in going along with the law. The law says, and I will read it once more:

Amounts in the trust fund shall be available as provided by appropriation acts for

making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways.

Those things are attributable to Federal aid to highways. We would not have to do this activity on the part of the Labor Department otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has given an excellent analysis of the pertinent portions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, so I do not intend to spend any time on the technical phases of that legislation.

A year ago, the Bureau of the Budget sent a request to the Senate, and they approved it, for a supplemental appropriation out of the highway trust fund to carry on this work that was written specifically into the act. That supplemental appropriation was voted by the Senate and was approved by the House and signed by the President of the United States.

Last year they used \$160,000 out of the highway trust fund for this purpose. This year the Bureau of the Budget and the President again sent to Congress a request for \$365,000 out of the highway trust fund to carry on this work that the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor is required by the Highway Act to carry out. That amount was recommended by the House committee. It was approved by the House.

The question was raised by the gentleman from Louisiana after that part of the bill had been read and it was too late to offer any amendment. It then went over to the other body. The other body did strike out that amount from the highway trust fund on the basis of a decision that was rendered to them by their legal counsel.

We went to conference yesterday on the basis of a ruling by the Comptroller General of the United States, on the basis of a ruling by the Solicitor of the Department of Labor and on the basis of a ruling by the Bureau of the Budget—

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman has had half the time on this question, so I am sorry but I decline to yield.

On two occasions they have sent to the Congress requests that they considered to be a part of the administration of the Highway Act and should be taken from the highway funds. We do not come from yesterday's conference asking you to appropriate the full \$365,000. We compromised with the Senate to the extent that the conference report carries only \$200,000 to carry on this work for the next fiscal year. Use of these funds for this purpose has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, by the President of the United States, the Solicitor of the Department of Labor, and by the Comptroller General.

As to the question that was asked by the gentleman from Indiana, are there any funds in the appropriation bill, if

this were not allowed, to enforce the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act as it applies to Federal-aid highways? The answer is "No." If this is turned down and you do not allow this \$200,000 there is not one dime that can be used for the enforcement of the Bacon-Davis provisions of the Highway Act, because this \$200,000 can be expended for that purpose only and for no other purposes and there were no other funds requested or included in the bill for that purpose. So there is no way that the Department of Labor or any other department of the Government can enforce them if this \$200,000 is disallowed.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island yield to the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker. I think we were very generous in giving the gentleman practically all the time he wanted when he made his own statement.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this is something to which we have given serious consideration. It has been agreed to by the Senate conferees, and the House conferees are in unanimous agreement on this conference report. We ask your support in its adoption. We have before us now a bill that calls for practically \$3 billion for the health, welfare, and education of the people of this country. I hope that the House will not adopt the motion that will be offered by the gentleman from Louisiana sending this conference report back to the conference committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report.

The Davis-Bacon Act last year was made applicable to the Federal Highway Act of 1956. The Davis-Bacon Act has been in effect for more than 30 years. It was authored by a Republican in the House, Mr. Bacon of New York, and by a Republican in the Senate, Senator Davis of Pennsylvania. The law was signed by a Republican President.

The Davis-Bacon Act makes the prevailing wage in a particular area applicable to the entire area. It has greatly stabilized wages on Federal projects and has made it impossible for chiselers to undercut legitimate contractors by undercutting and downgrading wages alone.

The Davis-Bacon Act has worked exceptionally well since its inception and for that reason was included in the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

For that reason the conference report between the House and the Senate on H. R. 6287 has included sufficient money for the enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act in the Federal Highway Act of 1956. I am supporting the conference act, and I shall vote against the motion to recommit the bill to the conference between the House and the Senate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. HIESTAND. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HIESTAND moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H. R. 6287, to the committee of conference.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Boggs) there were—yeas 36, noes 116.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 73, nays, 321, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—73

Abbott	Haley	Robeson, Va.
Abernethy	Hardy	Rogers, Fla.
Alexander	Harris	Rogers, Tex.
Ashmore	Harrison, Va.	Rutherford
Barden	Hébert	Scott, N. C.
Beckworth	Hemphill	Shuford
Boggs	Hiestand	Simpson, Pa.
Bonner	Jennings	Smith, Kans.
Boykin	Johansen	Smith, Miss.
Burleson	Jonas	Smith, Mo.
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Wis.
Cooper	Kilgore	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Kitchin	Teague, Tex.
Dorn, S. C.	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Dowdy	Lennon	Thompson, Tex.
Durham	Long	Thomson, Wyo.
Fallon	Loser	Trimble
Fisher	McMillan	Tuck
Flynt	Mills	Whitener
Forand	Murray	Whitten
Fountain	Passman	Williams, Miss.
Frazier	Poage	Willis
Gary	Reed	Winstead
Gathings	Riley	
Gregory	Rivers	

NAYS—321

Addonizio	Baldwin	Boyle
Albert	Baring	Bray
Alger	Barrett	Breeding
Allen, Calif.	Bass, N. H.	Brooks, La.
Allen, Ill.	Bass, Tenn.	Brooks, Tex.
Andersen	Bates	Broomfield
H. Carl	Baumbart	Brown, Ga.
Anderson	Becker	Brown, Mo.
Mont.	Belcher	Brown, Ohio
Andresen	Bennett, Fla.	Brownson
August H.	Bennett, Mich.	Broyhill
Andrews	Berry	Budge
Anfuso	Betts	Burdick
Arends	Blatnik	Bush
Ashley	Blich	Byrd
Aspinall	Boland	Byrne, Ill.
Auchincloss	Bolling	Byrne, Pa.
Avery	Bolton	Canfield
Ayres	Bosch	Cannon
Baker	Bow	Carnahan

Carrigg	Holmes	Pelly
Cederberg	Holt	Perkins
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Pfost
Chelf	Huddleston	Phillbin
Chenoweth	Hull	Pilcher
Chiperfield	Hyde	Pillion
Christopher	Ikard	Poff
Chudoff	Jackson	Polk
Church	James	Porter
Clark	Jarman	Powell
Clevenger	Jenkins	Preston
Coad	Johnson	Price
Cole	Jones, Mo.	Prouty
Collier	Judd	Rabaut
Corbett	Karsten	Radwan
Coudert	Kean	Rains
Cramer	Kearns	Ray
Cretella	Keating	Reece, Tenn.
Cunningham,	Kee	Rees, Kans.
Iowa	Keeney	Reuss
Cunningham,	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Nebr.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rhodes, Pa.
Curtin	Kilburn	Riehlman
Curtis, Mass.	Kilday	Roberts
Curtis, Mo.	Kling	Robson, Ky.
Dague	Kirwan	Rodino
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Rogers, Colo.
Dawson, Utah	Knox	Rogers, Mass.
Delaney	Knutson	Rooney
Dellay	Kreuger	Roosevelt
Dempsey	Lalrd	Sadlak
Dennison	Lane	Santangelo
Denton	Lanham	St. George
Derounian	LeCompte	Saund
Devereux	Lesinski	Schenck
Dies	Lipscomb	Scherer
Dingell	McCarthy	Schwengel
Dixon	McCormack	Sclvrner
Dollinger	McCulloch	Scudder
Donohue	McDonough	Seely-Brown
Dooley	McFall	Selden
Dorn, N. Y.	McGovern	Sheehan
Doyle	McGregor	Sieminski
Dwyer	McIntosh	Sikes
Eberharter	McVey	Siler
Edmondson	Macdonald	Simpson, Ill.
Elliott	Machrowicz	Sisk
Farbsteln	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Calif.
Fascell	Mack, Wash.	Spence
Feighan	Madden	Springer
Fenton	Magnuson	Staggers
Flno	Mahon	Stauffer
Flood	Mailliard	Sullivan
Fogarty	Marshall	Taber
Ford	Martin	Talle
Forrester	Mason	Teague, Calif.
Frelinghuysen	Matthews	Teller
Friedel	May	Tewes
Garmatz	Meader	Thomas
Gavin	Morrow	Thompson, N. J.
George	Metcalfe	Thornberry
Gordon	Michel	Tollefson
Granahan	Miller, Calif.	Udall
Gray	Miller, Md.	Ullman
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Nebr.	Vanlk
Green, Pa.	Miller, N. Y.	Van Pelt
Griffin	Minshall	Van Zandt
Griffiths	Moore	Vinson
Gross	Morano	Vorys
Gubser	Morgan	Vursell
Gwinn	Morris	Wainwright
Hagen	Moss	Walter
Halleck	Moulder	Watts
Harden	Mumma	Weaver
Harrison, Nebr.	Natcher	Westland
Harvey	Neal	Wharton
Haskell	Nicholson	Widnall
Hays, Ohio	Nimtz	Wier
Healey	Norblad	Wigglesworth
Henderson	Norrell	Williams, N. Y.
Herlong	O'Brien, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Heselton	O'Hara, Ill.	Withrow
Hess	O'Hara, Minn.	Wolverton
Hill	O'Konski	Wright
Hillings	O'Neill	Yates
Hoeven	Osmers	Young
Hoffman	Ostertag	Younger
Holifield	Patman	Zablocki
Holland	Patterson	

NOT VOTING—39

Adair	Evins	McIntire
Bailey	Fulton	Montoya
Beamer	Grant	Morrison
Bentley	Hale	Multer
Bowler	Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Holtzman	Saylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Scott, Pa.
Celler	Jensen	Shelley
Coffin	Kearney	Sheppard
Colmer	Keogh	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Lankford	Utt
Diggs	Latham	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	McConnell	Zelenko

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Beamer.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Hale.

Messrs. ANDERSON of Montana, JONES of Missouri, and BAKER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc those amendments which are in technical disagreement and on which the House managers will offer a motion to recede and concur as follows: Nos. 2, 8, 17, 18, 22, 27, 30, 37, 39, 44, and 47.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 13, insert "Provided, That the limitation of \$154,490 for international labor affairs appearing in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 423) is increased to \$159,490."

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 6, line 7, insert "of which \$10,000,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments."

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 17, line 9, after the words "fiscal year" insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the amount of allotment which States and Territories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned."

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 17, line 20, after "\$5,000,000" insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the amount of any State's allotment from this appropriation which such State certifies will remain unpaid to it on June 30, 1959, may be reallotted by the Commissioner among other

States applying therefor in proportion to their rural population, and deemed part of such allotments, except that no State's allotment shall be so increased as to exceed the allotment which would be made to it were this appropriation equal to the maximum authorized under such act."

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 24, line 20, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (70 Stat. 502), \$45,000,000 which together with the amount appropriated under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 769), shall be applied to payment on account of allotments made for the current and preceding fiscal years pursuant to said act, such sums to remain available only until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That allotments under such section 6 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of \$50,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 27: On page 28, line 12, after the word "projects" insert "and training grants."

Senate amendment No. 30: On page 30, line 2, after the semicolon strike out the balance of the line and lines 3 and 4 ending with the word "program" and insert the following: "and to contract on a cost or other basis for supplies and services by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy program, including indemnification of contractors to the extent and subject to the limitations provided in title 10, United States Code, section 2354, except that approval and certification required thereby shall be by the Surgeon General."

Senate amendment No. 37: On page 32, line 22, insert "Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year."

Senate amendment No. 39: On page 33, line 22, insert "Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For an additional amount for 'Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance' for construction of an office building and appurtenant facilities, including acquisition of land, \$5,710,000, to be derived from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which, together with sums heretofore appropriated for these purposes, shall establish a limitation of cost of \$31,080,000: *Provided*, That the established limit of cost may be exceeded or shall be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating from October 1, 1956, as determined by the Administrator, General Services Administration, and the amount to be derived from the aforesaid trust fund shall be increased or decreased accordingly: *Provided further*, That the immediately preceding proviso shall be effective only if a contract for construction is executed on or before December 1, 1957."

Senate amendment No. 44: On page 40, line 9, after "1959" insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That existing obligatory authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of the general office and the dental research buildings of the National Institutes of Health, and the National Library of Medicine building of the Public Health Service, shall remain available until June 30, 1958."

Senate amendment No. 47: On page 44, line 11, after the word "diem;" insert "Government listed telephones in private residences and private apartments for official use in cities where mediators are officially

stationed, but no Federal mediation and conciliation service office is maintained."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 17, 18, 22, 27, 30, 37, 39, 44 and 47, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 9, insert: "of which \$5,874,400 shall be derived by transfer from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, and."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$5,874,400", named in said amendment, insert "\$5,832,400."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 26, line 1, insert: "Surveys and planning for hospital construction: The funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 810) shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1959."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "June 30, 1959", named in said amendment, insert: "June 30, 1958."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 28, line 21, insert "National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of operation are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of estimated costs among the various appropriations involved may be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Director, including not to exceed \$2,500 each fiscal year for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by said Director, and for the op-

eration of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates to be determined by said Director to be sufficient to cover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in the fiscal year in which they are advanced: *Provided further*, That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appropriations from which such funds are advanced."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of operation are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of estimated costs among the various appropriations involved may be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Director, including the operation of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates to be determined by said Director to be sufficient to cover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in the fiscal year in which they are advanced: *Provided further*, That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appropriations from which such funds are advanced."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 40, line 25, insert:

"SEC. 210. To the extent and under the conditions provided by regulations of the Secretary, officers (including commissioned officers of the Public Health Service) and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may hereafter, in connection with their attendance at meetings or in performing advisory services concerned with the functions or activities of the Department, be permitted to accept payment, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal agencies, organizations, and individuals, for travel and subsistence expenses, to be retained by them to cover the cost thereof or deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost thereof is paid, as may be provided in such regulations."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and concur therein

with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "Sec. 210", named in said amendment, insert "Sec. 211."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in today's debate; and also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD or during debate on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to amendment 17 because I believe this reapportionment provision is a vicious tool for the forces who would spend and spend and perpetuate themselves on the Federal payroll. Furthermore, I do not believe it is right to use the taxes paid by one State for the personal benefit of another State and that certainly is the case involved here. Under this amendment, if my State does not use all of its Federal handout, this Federal money would then be reapportioned and given to some other State which already had received its share and wants more. This practice penalizes those States who are already doing a good job and do not want or need Federal help.

If we are to ever halt this practice of more and more Federal handout from Washington we should start by striking this reapportionment provision, and that is why I strongly oppose amendment 17.

Amendment 17 puts this reapportionment provision back into the bill after it was stricken out on a point of order when the bill first came up.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, since the time for general debate on the conference report was taken up with discussion of the motion to recommit, I take this opportunity to set forth the high points of the action taken by the conferees on the Senate amendments to the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1958. The original budget estimates totaled \$2,981,277,581. As the bill passed the House, it carried a total of \$2,846,831,581, a reduction of \$134,446,000 from the amount requested. The Senate increased the bill to \$2,885,290,781, or an increase of \$38,459,200 over the amount approved by the House. The amounts agreed upon in conference total \$2,871,182,781, or \$24,351,200 over the amount approved by the House, \$14,108,000 less than the amount approved by the Senate, and \$110,094,800 less than the amount requested in the President's budget, I think it is important to an understanding of the conferees' action to note that of the increase of \$24,351,200 by which the conference agreement is over the House bill, \$21 million is for increased activities of the National Institutes of Health. The total net increase other than that for the National

Institutes of Health is \$4,351,200 over the House bill, or an increase of just about one-tenths of 1 percent.

When this bill was considered by the House, 13 amendments involving reductions in funds were adopted. Following are the 13 items to which amendments

were adopted in the House, with figures setting forth the amounts reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations, the reduced amounts passed by the House, the amounts passed by the Senate, and the conference agreement:

Item	House committee	House	Senate	Conference
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
Office of the Secretary.....	\$1,510,000	\$1,480,000	\$1,480,000	\$1,480,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	2,225,000	2,021,000	2,191,000	2,121,000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards.....	1,031,300	985,000	985,000	985,000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employment Security.....	6,000,000	5,558,000	6,000,000	5,958,000
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.....	26,500,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Mexican farm-labor program.....	2,500,000	2,236,200	2,500,000	2,250,000
Grants to States:				
Base appropriation.....	250,000,000	249,814,000	250,000,000	249,814,000
Contingency fund.....	12,000,000		10,000,000	10,000,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics.....	7,470,000	7,124,000	7,225,000	7,200,000
Wage and Hour Division.....	10,888,000	10,600,000	10,600,000	10,600,000
HEW				
President's Committee on education beyond the high school.....	200,000		200,000	50,000
Bureau of Public Assistance.....	2,000,000	1,900,000	2,900,000	1,900,000
NLRB				
Salaries and expenses.....	9,450,000	9,384,800	9,384,800	9,384,800

It will be remembered, in connection with the appropriation for grants to States under the Department of Labor, that the contingency fund language was stricken from the bill on a point of order. Subsequently, the amount of funds which the stricken language had referred to was taken from the bill by amendment.

The Senate restored the contingency fund language with a slight revision and included \$10 million in lieu of the \$12 million that had originally been carried in the bill as reported by the House Committee on Appropriations. The conferees agreed to the language and thus it was almost automatic that they also agreed to the additional funds. With this one exception, no Senate increase to an item which was amended by the House was agreed to completely, and it will be noted from the figures in this table that the major part of the reductions voted by the House have been held in the final bill as brought back by the Managers on the part of the House.

As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, most of the difference between the Senate bill and the House bill was in the appropriations for medical research and related activities at the National Institutes of Health. The House had allowed the full budget estimate for each of the Institutes. The Senate increased the appropriations for 5 of the Institutes by a total of \$36,600,000. After very careful consideration and full discussion of these increases by the conferees of the House and the Senate, a compromise of \$21 million was agreed to. While there were widely divergent opinions expressed as to the proper amount, I think it is significant that ever member of the conference signed the report without reservation and I also think it is significant that we arrived at unanimous agreement as to the guidemarks which should be established in the use of the \$21 million increase. I will set forth the breakdown of the \$21 million which we will expect to be used as guidemarks by the Institutes in the expenditure of these additional funds.

For the National Cancer Institute, the Senate had increased the House bill by \$11,641,000. The conferees agreed on an increase of \$9,500,000, of which \$6,400,000 would be for contract work in the chemotherapy program, \$2,500,000 would be for research grants, \$250,000 would be for fellowships and training, and \$350,000 for direct research with germ-free animals.

For the National Institute of Mental Health, the Senate increase amounted to \$8,777,000, and the conferees agreed to an increase of \$4 million which is broken down as follows: \$1,500,000 for research grants; \$2 million for fellowships and training; and \$500,000 for direct operations with primary emphasis on the research planned to be done at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

For the National Heart Institute, the Senate increased the House bill by \$5,348,000. The conferees agreed upon an increase of \$2,500,000 of which \$1 million would be for their center on aging, most of which is to be used in connection with the Baltimore study, \$1 million for fellowships and training, and \$500,000 for direct operations.

The Senate increased the appropriations for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases by \$5,663,000 and the conferees agreed upon an increase of \$2,500,000. This increase is aimed to give the Institute an additional \$1,500,000 for research grants including \$500,000 to start a research program in gastroenterology, \$650,000 for fellowships and training, and \$350,000 for direct operations.

The appropriation for the National Institute of Neurology and Blindness was increased by the Senate by \$5,171,000. The conferees agreed upon an increase of \$2,500,000, of which \$1 million would be for research grants, including \$500,000 for additional work in connection with the collaborative program in diseases and disorders that arise in the perinatal period, and \$500,000 additional for research on hearing; \$1,250,000 for fellowships and training; and \$250,000 for direct operations.

While there were other Senate amendments, I believe that I have covered the most important items which were subject to action by the conferees, however, I would like to mention one more just for the purpose of emphasis. The House conferees in agreeing to concur in the amendment of the Senate Numbered 39 did so without reservation. The Senate report makes quite clear what is intended by this amendment, if it is not clear by itself. I trust that the officials of the executive branch concerned with this matter will give full consideration to both the House and Senate reports on this bill and to the unanimous action of the conferees on this amendment and be guided thereby in making their decision on whether or not to proceed expeditiously with the construction of the OASI building in Baltimore.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, in view of all the circumstances, the Managers on the part of the House have brought back a very good bill.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 4520

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I filed a report on the bill H. R. 4520 and at that time asked unanimous consent that any Member of the minority have until midnight Wednesday, tonight, to file a report to accompany this bill. I now ask unanimous consent that the authority for the minority to file a report on the bill may be extended until midnight tomorrow night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. THORNBERRY), reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 296, Rept. No. 640), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7390) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 297, Rept. No. 641), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7383) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS FOR ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 298, Rept. No. 642), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1428) to authorize furniture and furnishings for the additional office building for the United States Senate. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ENLARGEMENT AND REMODELING, UNITED STATES SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 299, Rept. No. 643), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1429) authorizing the enlargement and remodeling of Senators' suites and structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building, to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as

ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASING LIMIT OF COST, CON- STRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT, AD- DITIONAL UNITED STATES SEN- ATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 300, Rept. No. 644), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1430) increasing the limit of cost fixed for construction and equipment of an additional office building for the United States Senate. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CLARIFYING THE GENERAL POW- ERS, INCREASING THE BORROW- ING AUTHORITY, AND AUTHOR- IZING THE DEFERMENT OF INTEREST PAYMENTS ON BOR- ROWINGS OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPO- RATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 284 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5728) to clarify the general powers, increase the borrowing authority, and authorize the deferment of interest payments on borrowing, of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 284 provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate on H. R. 5728. This bill amends the act of May 13, 1954, which

created the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The bill clarifies and amends the corporate powers provided in the original act to provide for services and facilities necessary for the seaway, and services at reasonable prices to users and visitors. It also provides for the participation in a toll-bridge corporation and further provides that the payments received for facilities and services will be credited to the Corporation and these amounts are made available to the Corporation to pay any obligation or expense.

H. R. 5728 also amends section 5 of the original act by increasing the borrowing power of the Corporation from \$105 million to \$140 million. The amount of bonds which may be issued during any one year is raised from 40 percent of the total borrowing power to 50 percent. Upon the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury the interest on the bonds may be deferred during construction and paid from revenues and not charged to the borrowing authority of the Corporation.

In order to obtain closer coordination between preliminary estimates and ultimate construction costs the Corporation is required to submit special reports to the House and Senate whenever changes are made involving new or discarded features of the seaway amounting to more than \$1 million in cost.

As the Members of the House know, the Corporation is a self-liquidating corporation and none of the construction and operating costs are chargeable to appropriation funds; thus it is intended that all cost will be recovered from users of the seaway and the borrowed money will be repaid, with interest, to the Treasury from toll revenues.

The proposals contained in the bill are part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1957, and have the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 284 so the House may proceed to the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has explained in detail the purposes of this resolution, which makes in order the consideration the bill H. R. 5728, with two hours of general debate, a bill which would permit the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to increase by some \$35 million its borrowing capacity, and make other changes in the present law. The measure has the support of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and the Administration generally.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the Committee on Public Works for reporting out this bill, and also the Committee on Rules and the leadership for scheduling it for early action. This bill certainly has my wholehearted support.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 28, 1957
For actions of June 27, 1957
85th-1st, No. 112

CONTENTS

Accounting.....22	Federal aid.....10	Organization.....19,32
Acreage reserve.....38	Foreign affairs.....5	Peanuts.....18
Adjournment.....16	Forestry.....15,17,24,27	Personnel.....25,37
Administrative orders...21	4-H Clubs.....34	Postal service.....26
Agricultural	Housing.....20	Public Law 480.....1
appropriations.....17	Industrial uses.....40	Reclamation.....8
Appropriations.....6,15,17	Information.....30	Recreation.....36
Brucellosis.....35	Insecticides.....33	Research.....9
Budget.....11	Interest rates.....12	Security.....37
Buildings.....3	Interior	Soil conservation.....14
Conservation.....28	appropriation...15,17,27	Surplus commodities...1,23
Corn.....30,31	Lands.....24	Trade, foreign.....1
Cotton.....2	Legislative program..15,27	Transportation.....4
Dairy products.....35	Marketing.....39	Water.....13,29
Education.....41	Minerals.....6	Wildlife.....33
Electrification.....8		

HIGHLIGHTS: (See Page 5.)

SENATE

1. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Disagreed with the House amendments to S. 1314, to extend Public Law 480 until 1958, and appointed as conferees Sens. Ellender, Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Aiken, Young, Thye, and Hickenlooper. Consideration of H.R. 6974, a similar bill, was indefinitely postponed. p. 9382
2. COTTON. Passed without amendment H.J. Res. 172, to release 50,000 bales of extra long staple cotton from the Strategic Materials stockpile. This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. 9398-9
3. BUILDINGS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment S. 2261, to amend the Federal lease-purchase program relative to the distribution and approval of new public buildings projects (S. Rept. 540). p. 9358
4. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 1383, to require the certification by the ICC of freight forwarders (S. Rept. 542). p. 9358
Passed without amendment S. 1459, to require truck and bus charter operators to apply for ICC approval. pp. 9435-6

5. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Passed, with an amendment to exempt agreements under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, S. 603, to require the transmission to the Senate within 60 days of execution, all international agreements . pp. 9436-7
Sen. Wiley inserted a report on the 1957 Bricker Amendment.
pp. 9368-74
6. MINERALS. Passed without amendment H.R. 4748, to extend to 1958 the time during which annual assessment work may be done on unpatented mining claims. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 9432-3
Sen. Neuberger criticized the administration of Public Law 359, 84th Congress, which opened to mining claims 7.2 million acres of Federally controlled lands, and inserted a series of articles on the wisdom of opening public lands to mining interests. pp. 9378-80
7. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H.R. 6070, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1958. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 9422-4, 9442-6
Agreed to the conference report on H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 9382-8
Passed as reported H.R. 7599, the Legislative branch appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 9404-8
8. ELECTRIFICATION; RECLAMATION. Passed as reported S. 60, to authorize construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project, rejecting two amendments by Sen. Kuchel which would require the Secretary of the Interior to comply with compacts now applying to the river, and stating that the law should not constitute any sort of commitment for further water transfers. pp. 9410, 9416-22, 9424-32
9. RESEARCH. Received from this Department a report on the State agricultural experiment stations for fiscal year 1956. p. 9358
10. FEDERAL AID. Sen. Smith, N.J., inserted two editorials on the President's proposal to study Federal-State relations and the division of functions between them. pp. 9363-4
11. BUDGET. Sen. Goldwater inserted his comments on, and Sen. Bush inserted excerpts from, the report on Fiscal policy implications of the economic outlook and budget developments by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. pp. 9364-6
12. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Humphrey inserted a series of articles on interest rates and the administration's fiscal policy. pp. 9399-9404
13. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Morton called the Ohio River Valley "The Ruhr of the U.S." and pointed out the present state of development of its water resources. pp. 9410-12
14. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Yarborough stated that a report of the Soil Conservation Service showed the values of soil conservation in preventing flood damage and protecting the land, and inserted an editorial on the importance of proper care for soil. p. 9424
15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill should be received Mon., July 1, and that the Defense Department appropriation bill should also be considered then. p. 9437
16. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 1. pp. 9437-8

dead even though it has received rebuffs from other departments of Government.

Recently, in an article in the *New Republic*, Senator HUMPHREY called attention to the fact that the U. N. Disarmament Subcommittee had, since its inception several years ago, conducted its discussions on a catch-as-catch-can basis, without a formal agenda, and suggested that an agenda might serve to aid negotiations in the future. Shortly thereafter, when the meetings opened in March 1957, a seven-point agenda was adopted by the subcommittee at the instance of Governor Stassen. Observers agreed that this was a valuable improvement in procedures.

The interest of Adlai Stevenson in a ban on nuclear tests has been traced to the testimony before the subcommittee by Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray. Stevenson's first speech on the subject was made very shortly after Murray's testimony, and followed Murray's reasoning closely.

In spite of the rather blank response which Stevenson's ideas drew from the electorate, his position has made a considerable impression on several Democrats in Congress. HUMPHREY asked about radiation hazards at several hearings; and provided a forum for a good deal of discussion of the problem. Indeed, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is now exploring the problem in considerable detail, largely as a result of HUMPHREY's initiative, which included a public letter suggesting the urgency of a thorough investigation.

Senator HUMPHREY also repeatedly asked why it would not be just as effective to set up an inspection system simultaneously with arms cuts, and helped the administration to realize that the insistence upon setting up a full-blown inspection mechanism in working order before the beginning of any type of arms cuts, was becoming a King Charles' head.

HUMPHREY's persistence in asking about political settlements strengthened Stassen's hand in demanding authority to discuss certain political matters in Disarmament Commission meetings. Unfortunately, this was never granted, but the necessity for it is becoming increasingly recognized. The testimony of George Kennan made it clear that any broad-scale disarmament program was in itself a political settlement and, also, that some of the most feasible immediate approaches were very much involved with political matters.

II

In many ways, the outstanding testimony before the subcommittee was given by Secretary of State Dulles. Dulles obviously came to the hearing without briefing himself too closely on the current position of his Department. He had, however, in the years before becoming Secretary of State, given considerable thought to the problem of long-range peace plans and disarmament, and permitted himself to relax and think out loud. The young men from the State Department who accompanied him listened with open mouths, and a large number of transcripts were ordered immediately afterward by the Department for internal circulation, because he composed policy as he went along. The hearing was a very cordial one, and it was interesting to note that the Senators of the opposition party respected his honesty and did not attempt to take advantage of his candor.

In effect, Secretary Dulles made clear that any arms agreement would sooner or later have to include Communist China. Mr. Dulles also made it clear that political settlements must go hand in hand with arms reductions. With reference to Germany, for example, he said that a settlement "would not be practical without at least a partial

settlement of the armament problem, notably in relation to Europe."

Mr. Dulles also, in response to questions from Senator HICKENLOOPER, indicated that the sound approach to disarmament should eventually involve the building up of a United Nations force which would be superior to any possible aggressor force. An ideal arrangement, he said, would be to have in some such body as the United Nations, a dependable force which would be greater than the force of any single member state; in other words, to extend to the society of nations the principle which is, broadly speaking, applied to maintain peace and order within a national society. However, he pointed out that involved certain supernatural aspects and also the question of renouncing the veto power and, therefore, regarded it as not a goal which can be practically attainable within any foreseeable period. For the immediate future, therefore, he pointed out that it is necessary to have collective forces which, when brought together, would be superior to the forces of an aggressor. The candor and imagination which the Secretary displayed at that hearing has not, in the intervening 16 months, however, produced appreciable change in the Department's positions.

In selecting highlights from the testimony of other witnesses for this necessarily brief report, emphasis will be placed upon those who made the strongest impression upon the committee members, as revealed by their public or private remarks on subsequent occasions.

Some of the impact of Commissioner Thomas E. Murray's testimony has already been alluded to. A tally of newspaper reports of committee hearings indicated that Murray's testimony received wider press attention than that of any other witness. In subsequent hearings, a large number of witnesses associated themselves with his suggestions that policies be adapted to set our nuclear weapons program "on a basis more in conformity with the realities of present-day international life."

Murray's argument can be summarized as follows: Wars in the future will be nuclear wars. This does not mean that they need be all-out nuclear wars. All-out nuclear war is no more acceptable than murder or suicide. It would be fatal to permit ourselves to drift into the habit of thinking about nuclear war only in all-out terms. A limited nuclear war is a possibility that our consciences can face and accept. In the different kinds of limited war that might confront us, certain types of nuclear weapons have a genuine military usefulness. It would therefore be wrong on our part to deprive ourselves of these weapons. Our stockpile should include only weapons that are useful in war. Moreover, it should include only weapons that we can legitimately use. It is time we stopped to take a hard look at this concept of "deterrence" and at the complementary concept, more recently added, the "balance of terror," which is too easily upset. It is at the mercy of miscalculation. Such a balance may even put a premium on moral cynicism. Rational armament therefore should include the making and stockpiling only of such weapons as are demonstrably useful for the purpose of actual warfare.

Murray suggested that an upper limit be set on the size of thermonuclear bombs to be placed in our stockpile, on the basis of moral principles and military usefulness. Tests of multimegaton thermonuclear weapons should be stopped, since the weapons we now have in hand are large enough. But tens of thousands of very small weapons are needed. Flexible strength requires the fuller development of the capability for limited military use of nuclear weapons for limited

military objectives, according to the Commissioner.

The deeply religious tone of Commissioner Murray's testimony, and his emphasis on moral points won for it considerable attention among citizens' groups concerned with world peace.

Another witness whose testimony had considerable influence on the committee was Warren Weaver, vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation and chairman of the Committee on the Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation of the National Academy of Sciences. Weaver's testimony challenged the complacency with which the report of the academy has been interpreted by the administration. While he carefully eschewed sensationalism or alarmism, and did not quarrel with the precise language of the report, he made it abundantly clear that the net effect of continued explosions would necessarily be disadvantageous to the genetic structure of the human race. Probably the serious interest of subcommittee members in proposals to end tests was greatly heightened by the Weaver testimony.

John C. Eliot, a former Director of the Office of Munitions Control of the Department of State, discussed techniques of munitions control developed under the Neutrality Act as possible guideposts in general armaments control. Although he conceded that the development of guided missiles and thermonuclear weapons has made the problem of control and reduction of armaments more difficult, he said that the Government need not content itself with atomic stalemate. On the basis of his experience, he suggested that it would be fruitful to continue the search on political, military, and scientific fronts for some formula for eliminating or controlling weapons. He felt that our proposals for disarmament, while sound and sincere, were insufficiently broad to excite the imaginations of peoples and thereby to pressure the Soviets into a workable disarmament agreement with adequate inspection. He urged a U. N. study on the effect of arms traffic to disturbed areas of the world. His testimony elicited sympathetic comment from Senator Humphrey and helped bring the inspection problem into focus.

The testimony of Dr. Albert G. Hill, vice president of the Institute for Defense Analysis and director of Research Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, was important because of his close association with the development of an early warning system for the United States Government. Dr. Hill pointed out that aerial inspection alone would be insufficient as a warning against surprise attack. He felt that any effective inspection must consist of both aerial and ground components. However, he commented that any inspection arrangement with the Soviet Union would probably be to our advantage today. Further, he stated that the mere agreement upon such a system would improve possibilities for the beginning of phased disarmament.

The committee members gave considerable thought to the testimony by one of their colleagues, Senator RALPH FLANDERS of Vermont. Senator FLANDERS has long been a passionate advocate of disarmament. In 1953, he was coauthor of a disarmament resolution which was unanimously passed by the Senate. He appeared before the subcommittee accompanied by a Reserve Air Force officer with considerable credentials in both arms and arms control, Colonel Richard S. Leghorn, now of the Eastman Kodak Co. Flanders and Leghorn pointed out that we have already passed the point of no return on many types of arms inspection and control. They warned that we were approaching one of the most serious of these points with the forthcoming development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. They urged

that the United States immediately propose an agreement with the Soviet Union which would effectively prevent the perfection of these missiles. This could be done, they said, by agreeing not to test the missiles. They stated that the missiles developed in the laboratory and on the drawing board would not be useful in warfare without the developmental improvements which would result from actual test firings. While there would be no way to detect laboratory work, it would be possible to detect test firings through properly emplaced radar posts.

The Flanders-Leghorn proposal was discussed by the subcommittee in the course of appearances of many other witnesses. Many of them, including Dr. Albert Hill, agreed that radar could be effective in detecting these tests. However, one important political question, raised by Senator SYMINGTON, remained unanswered: The question of how the nations of western Europe, already threatened by lesser range missiles, would take to the urgent insistence of the United States that work be stopped on the one weapon which might effectively reach the United States.

Benjamin V. Cohen, who served for many years as United States representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, pointed out that: "Drastic and general disarmament presents less difficulty in respect to policing and inspection than limited and partial disarmament * * * drastic and general disarmament coupled with the transfer of a reserve of armaments to U. N. authorities would further impair the decisive importance of any secreted armaments which might escape detection. * * * Law enforcement in the international field, like law enforcement in the domestic field, depends not on a vast accumulation of arms in the possession of the peace officers, but on a rigid limitation of arms in the possession of organized groups not responsible or responsive to the peace officer."

Cohen supported the State Department position that one of the chief sanctions in any disarmament treaty should be the right to withdraw from a disarmament agreement. Such a right, Cohen thought, might encourage progress which would otherwise be impossible.

While advocating a complete and comprehensive plan, Cohen also supported immediate proposals for partial disarmament. He said there are two areas in which proposals could be made which would contribute significantly toward progress in disarmament. The first area covers measures which would tend to arrest or slow down the armaments race without materially affecting the present balance of power, and the breach of which measures would be self-detectable. The second area is the combining of political settlement and disarmament for reasons about which international conflict and tension center.

Specifically, Cohen urged certain immediate steps: (1) The reporting of all or defined nuclear tests and of all or defined ballistic missile tests to the extent necessary to insure minimum safety and health; (2) the banning of nuclear tests with defined widespread radioactive effects and of tests of long-range ballistic missiles; (3) the control of future production of fissionable materials; (4) aerial inspection and exchange of blueprints of military installations; (5) ground inspection control posts at designated points; (6) the establishment of a world network of radar and other monitoring devices.

Many other witnesses made notable impressions. At Cambridge, Mass., a group of university scholars presented fascinating discussions of major problems. This tour de force, which was arranged by Associate Dean David Cavers, of the Harvard Law School, was, in some respects, the outstanding congressional hearing of the year, and

the chairman alluded to it frequently in later months. An idea presented in the hearing by Duncan MacDonald, dean of the graduate school of Boston University, received particularly close attention: that the effectiveness of inspection measures be tested by aerial inspection conducted between friendly powers.

David Inglis, of the Argonne National Laboratory, made a particularly strong impression on some members of the committee when he stressed the need for a vastly increased budget for a Government agency working on peace problems. Considerable emphasis was also placed by several witnesses upon the need for preparation for the economic reconversion which would be necessitated by serious efforts in the direction of arms cuts.

III

As this is written, the Humphrey subcommittee has not finished its work. Two major questions remain unanswered:

What will it say in its final report? One speculates that it will not be controversial in character because of a generally understood determination on the part of the chairman that the report be unanimously adopted. This means, in effect, that the report will be the least common denominator of the opinions of the committee members. This is not necessarily to be regretted—it would be difficult for the committee to take original and creative positions on matters which involve so many complex and technical factors. But one also suspects that if the committee members fail to agree on some basic assumptions, such as the urgency of disarmament and the inadequacy of mutual deterrents as a permanent safeguard to security, there will be majority and minority reports.

Will there be a permanent unit working in this field? Scholars and commentators who take the disarmament problem seriously feel that the subcommittee has accomplished a great deal, and hope to see its life extended. If this is impossible, they would like to see a special committee established to continue its work.

The major contribution of the subcommittee is that it has taken disarmament down from the pie-in-the-sky category and made it a matter of current legislative business. It has made newspapers, magazines, radio, and TV commentators, legislators and bureaucrats, take seriously the problem of control and reduction of armaments. It has forced some consideration of long-range policy upon a capital which is enormously preoccupied with this morning's crisis and tonight's deadline. Such interest and concern in arms control is vital if intelligent and successful policies are to be evolved.

It would be tragic if this effort is not permitted to continue, either through an extension of the life of the subcommittee or through the creation of a new special committee which could take up where the Humphrey subcommittee leaves off.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1314) to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 109 and 204 of such act are amended by striking out "1957" and substituting in lieu thereof "1958."

(2) Section 103 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "\$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000,000."

(3) In the first proviso contained in section 104, after the words "subsection (f)" and before the word "and" insert: "and for financing international educational exchange activities under subsection (h) and for financing the translation, publication, and distribution of books and periodicals under subsection (i)."

(4) Section 203 of such act is amended by striking out "\$500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$800,000,000."

(5) Section 104 (e) of such act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end thereof and adding a comma and the following: "for which purposes not more than 25 percent of the currencies received pursuant to each such agreement shall be available through and under the procedures established by the Export-Import Bank for loans mutually agreeable to said bank and the country with which the agreement is made to United States business firms and branches, subsidiaries, or affiliates of such firms for business development and trade expansion in such countries and for the establishment of facilities for aiding in the utilization, distribution, or otherwise increasing the consumption of, and markets for, United States agricultural products: *Provided, however,* That no such loans shall be made for the manufacture of any products to be exported to the United States in competition with products produced in the United States. Foreign currencies may be accepted in repayment of such loans."

(6) Within 60 days after any agreement is entered into for the use of any foreign currencies, a full report thereon shall be made to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Committees on Agriculture and Appropriations thereof.

(7) Section 210 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, Public Law 540, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 202), is amended (1) by inserting after the word "State" the words "and local penal and," and (2) by striking out "for minors."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now move that H. R. 6974 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, H. R. 6974 is indefinitely postponed.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous

consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 25, 1957, p. 9165, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill, H. R. 6287, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, as it passed the Senate was for a total of \$2,885,290,781, an increase of \$38,459,200 over the House allowance, but \$96,636,800 under the budget estimates.

The conference agreement as it has been agreed to in the House signed by all Senate Conferees provides for the appropriation of \$2,871,182,781, a reduction of \$14,108,800 from the Senate allowance, an increase of \$24,350,400 over the House allowance, but \$110,745,600 under the budget estimates and \$13,676,200 under the 1957 appropriations.

I will make brief comment with respect to several of the amendments of particular interest to Senators.

The Senate position with respect to the availability of funds for the Federal portion of State and local administrative expenses of the public assistance programs was accepted and the funds will be available without limitation for this purpose.

The Senate approved \$15 million for grants to States for public health activities of our local public health units, an increase of \$3 million, in the item "Assistance to States, general" and the conferees accepted the Senate proposal.

The Senate had approved increases of \$32,027,000 for the National Institutes of Health for medical research in the killing and crippling diseases. The committee of conference finally agreed upon a figure \$21 million over the House. It should be stated that the conferees on

the part of the Senate sought approval of a higher sum but our colleagues from the other body were adamant in opposition to anything additional.

The conferees were in general agreement with the allocation of the increases in the several accounts as follows:

For the National Cancer Institute, \$9,500,000 over the House allowance, of which \$6,400,000 is for contracts in the cancer chemotherapy program; \$2,500,000 is for research grants; \$250,000 is for training and fellowships, and \$350,000 is for direct operations with particular emphasis on the work with germ-free animals. This provides a total appropriation of \$56,402,000 for the National Cancer Institute.

For mental health activities, \$4 million over the House allowance, of which \$1,500,000 shall be used for research grants; \$2 million for research training and fellowships; and \$500,000 for direct operations particularly in the direct research at St. Elizabeths Hospital. This provides a total appropriation for "mental health activities" of \$39,217,000.

For the National Heart Institute, \$2,500,000 over the House allowance of which \$1 million is for the extension of the program in aging, including a project underway in Baltimore; \$1 million for research training and fellowships; and \$500,000 for direct operations. This provides a total appropriation of \$35,936,000 for the National Heart Institute.

For arthritis and metabolic disease activities, \$2,500,000 over the House allowance, of which \$1,500,000 is for research grants, including \$500,000 for expanded work in gastroenterology with particular emphasis on peptic ulcer, ulcerative colitis, hepatitis, and ileitis; \$650,000 for research training and fellowships; and \$350,000 for direct operations. This provides a total appropriation of \$20,385,000 for "Arthritis and metabolic disease activities."

For neurology and blindness activities, \$2,500,000 over the House allowance, of which \$1 million is for research grants including \$500,000 for research in hearing disorders and \$500,000 for expansion of the collaborative studies in perinatal diseases; \$1,250,000 is for training and fellowships; and \$250,000 is for di-

rect operations. This provides a total appropriation of \$21,387,000 for "Neurology and blindness activities."

The bill carries altogether a total of \$211,183,000 in appropriations for medical research.

There is one item in the Department of Labor with respect to which the Senate conferees were unable to maintain the Senate's position—that of the transfer of funds from the highway trust fund for the administrative expenses of the Solicitor in making wage determinations on road construction projects in the Interstate System in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act as provided in section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

The House had provided \$365,000 for this purpose to be derived by transfer from the trust fund—as is presently provided for the current year in the amount of \$300,000—and the Senate had stricken out the transfer provision and had directed the Department to submit a supplemental estimate for appropriated funds not later than July 1, 1957.

The managers on the part of the House were insistent that these expenses were attributable to the Federal-aid highways and chargeable to the trust fund notwithstanding the position of the Senate that the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 did not authorize the use of the fund for such expenses. The Senate conferees were finally forced to yield and to agree to the provision of \$200,000, rather than \$365,000 as provided by the House, to be derived by transfer from the highway trust fund.

There was opposition to this amendment in the House yesterday when the conference report was being considered. A motion was made to recommit the bill to conference because of opposition to the amendment, but the motion was rejected by a vote of 73 to 321.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the results of the conference between the two Houses.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Appropriation 1957	Budget estimate 1958	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
Office of the Secretary:					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1, 775, 000	\$1, 619, 000	\$1, 480, 000	\$1, 480, 000	\$1, 480, 000
Revolving fund.....		150, 000			
Office of the Solicitor.....	2, 021, 000	2, 263, 000	2, 021, 000	2, 191, 000	2, 121, 000
Transfer from highway trust fund.....	[300, 000]	[365, 000]	[365, 000]	None	[200, 000]
Bureau of Labor Standards.....	911, 500	1, 167, 000	985, 000	985, 000	985, 000
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.....	383, 000	542, 000	542, 000	542, 000	542, 000
Bureau of Apprenticeship.....	3, 399, 000	3, 940, 000	3, 600, 000	3, 600, 000	3, 600, 000
Bureau of Employment Security:					
Salaries and expenses.....	5, 558, 000	6, 358, 000	5, 558, 000	125, 600	125, 600
Transfer from unemployment trust fund.....				[5, 874, 400]	[5, 832, 400]
Grants to States.....	250, 000, 000	270, 000, 000	249, 814, 000	260, 000, 000	259, 814, 000
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	70, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	36, 800, 000	36, 800, 000	36, 800, 000
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.....	25, 000, 000	32, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	25, 000, 000
Mexican farm labor program.....	2, 125, 000	2, 683, 000	2, 236, 200	2, 500, 000	2, 250, 000
Bureau of Employees' Compensation:					
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 347, 000	2, 838, 000	2, 838, 000	2, 838, 000	2, 838, 000
Employees' compensation fund.....	[50, 000, 000]	Indefinite	Indefinite	Indefinite	Indefinite
Bureau of Labor Statistics:					
Salaries and expenses.....	6, 875, 000	7, 768, 000	7, 124, 000	7, 225, 000	7, 200, 000
Women's Bureau.....	403, 000	462, 000	462, 000	462, 000	462, 000
Wage and Hour Division.....	9, 988, 000	10, 888, 000	10, 600, 000	10, 600, 000	10, 600, 000
Total, Department of Labor.....	380, 785, 500	384, 678, 000	349, 060, 200	354, 348, 600	353, 817, 600

	Appropriation 1957	Budget estimate 1958	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
American Printing House for the Blind.....	\$230,000	\$328,000	\$328,000	\$328,000	\$328,000
Food and Drug Administration:					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,779,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
Certification and inspection services.....	[1,200,000]	[1,254,500]	[1,254,500]	[1,254,500]	[1,254,500]
Freedmen's Hospital.....	2,801,400	3,032,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Gallaudet College:					
Salaries and expenses.....	615,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	730,000
Construction.....	2,547,000	1,690,000	1,690,000	1,690,000	1,690,000
Howard University:					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,300,000	4,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Plans and specifications.....		150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Construction of buildings.....	100,000	262,000	262,000	262,000	262,000
Construction of buildings, liquidation of contract authority.....	286,200				
Office of Education:					
Promotion and further development of vocational education.....	31,442,081	33,750,081	33,442,081	33,750,081	33,750,081
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.....	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500	2,501,500
Grants for library services.....	2,050,000	3,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Payments to school districts.....	113,050,000	127,000,000	127,000,000	127,000,000	127,000,000
School construction.....	108,500,000	41,800,000	41,700,000	41,700,000	41,700,000
Salaries and expenses.....	5,270,000	7,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.....	150,000	300,000		200,000	50,000
Grants for State committees on education beyond the high school.....		650,000	N. C.	None	
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:					
Grants to States and other agencies.....	39,500,000	45,100,000	45,100,000	45,100,000	45,100,000
Training and traineeships.....	2,950,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
Salaries and expenses.....	1,160,000	1,445,000	1,330,000	1,330,000	1,330,000
Public Health Service:					
Assistance to States, general.....	17,591,000	24,609,000	19,592,000	22,592,000	22,592,000
Grants and special studies, Alaska.....	1,170,000	2,165,000	2,165,000	2,165,000	2,165,000
Venereal diseases.....	4,195,000	4,415,000	4,415,000	4,415,000	4,415,000
Tuberculosis.....	6,660,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Communicable diseases.....	5,750,000	6,260,000	6,200,000	6,250,000	6,250,000
Sanitary engineering activities.....	9,000,000	13,063,000	12,640,000	12,640,000	12,640,000
Grants for waste treatment works construction.....	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
Grants for hospital construction.....	125,000,000	121,200,000	121,200,000	121,200,000	121,200,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.....	1,381,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Hospitals and medical care.....	40,195,000	44,399,000	44,399,000	44,399,000	44,399,000
Foreign quarantine service.....	3,315,000	4,025,000	3,876,000	3,876,000	3,876,000
Indian health activities.....	38,775,000	43,990,000	40,000,000	42,500,000	40,100,000
Construction of Indian health facilities.....	8,762,000	5,800,000	3,096,000	3,096,000	3,096,000
National Institutes of Health:					
General research and services.....	12,122,000	14,026,000	14,026,000	14,026,000	14,026,000
National Cancer Institute.....	48,432,000	46,902,000	46,902,000	58,543,000	56,402,000
Mental health activities.....	35,197,000	35,217,000	35,217,000	39,421,000	39,217,000
National Heart Institute.....	33,396,000	33,436,000	33,436,000	38,784,000	35,936,000
Dental health activities.....	6,026,000	6,430,000	6,430,000	6,430,000	6,430,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities.....	15,885,000	17,885,000	17,885,000	23,548,000	20,385,000
Allergy and infectious disease activities.....	13,292,000	17,400,000	17,400,000	17,400,000	17,400,000
Neurology and blindness activities.....	18,650,000	18,887,000	18,887,000	24,058,000	21,387,000
Grants for construction of research facilities.....	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Construction of animal quarters.....	1,371,000				
Construction of general office building.....	300,000				
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.....	147,000				
Retired pay of commissioned officers.....	1,450,000	1,570,000	None	Indefinite	Indefinite
Construction of surgical facilities.....	1,630,000				
Construction of dental research building.....	200,000				
National Library of Medicine (operating expenses).....	[1,314,767]	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Construction of library facilities.....	350,000				
Salaries and expenses.....	3,892,000	5,150,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
Totals, Public Health Service.....	534,141,000	556,730,000	542,766,000	575,343,000	561,916,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital:					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,870,000	3,265,000	3,000,000	3,085,800	3,085,800
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds.....	270,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Construction.....	7,494,000	180,060	180,000	180,000	180,000
Social Security Administration:					
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance:					
Salaries and expenses.....	[121,500,000]	[131,000,000]	[130,000,000]	[130,000,000]	[130,000,000]
Construction.....				[5,710,000]	[5,710,000]
Grants to States for training of public welfare personnel.....		2,500,000	None	None	None
Bureau of Public Assistance:					
Grants to States.....	1,575,000,000	1,679,400,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....	1,748,000	2,216,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Children's Bureau:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,822,000	2,154,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.....	39,361,000	41,500,000	41,500,000	41,500,000	41,500,000
Cooperative research or demonstration projects in social security.....		2,080,000	None	None	None
Office of the Commissioner:					
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	212,000	315,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Office of the Secretary:					
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[160,000]	[244,000]	[240,000]	[240,000]	[240,000]
Office of Field Administration:					
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	1,588,000	2,015,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Office of the General Counsel:					
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[225,000]	[282,000]	[260,000]	[260,000]	[260,000]
Office of the General Counsel:					
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	1,985,000	2,355,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Office of the General Counsel:					
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	[158,000]	[708,000]	[700,000]	[700,000]	[700,000]
Office of the General Counsel:					
Transfer from OASI and Food and Drug.....	426,000	559,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Surplus property utilization.....	[419,100]	[477,000]	[450,000]	[474,000]	[474,000]
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	2,490,599,181	2,582,764,581	2,483,536,581	2,518,707,381	2,503,130,381
RELATED AGENCIES					
National Labor Relations Board.....	8,951,500	9,575,000	9,384,800	9,384,800	9,384,800
National Mediation Board:					
Salaries and expenses.....	475,500	520,000	520,000	520,000	520,000
Arbitration and emergency boards.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
National Railroad Adjustment Board.....	486,500	525,000	525,000	525,000	525,000
Railroad Retirement Board: Salaries and expenses.....	[7,600,000]	[8,150,000]	[8,150,000]	[8,150,000]	[8,150,000]
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,295,000	3,610,000	3,550,000	3,550,000	3,550,000
Boards of inquiry.....	10,000				
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Soldiers' Home.....	[6,643,000]	[4,750,000]	[4,750,000]	[4,750,000]	[4,750,000]
Grand total.....	2,884,858,181	2,981,927,581	2,846,831,581	2,885,290,781	2,871,182,781

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report. The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6287, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 26, 1957.

Resolved, that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 17, 18, 22, 27, 30, 37, 39, 44, and 47 to the bill (H. R. 6287) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes," and concur therein,

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "\$5,-874,400" named in said amendment, insert "\$5,832,400."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "June 30, 1959" named in said amendment, insert "June 30, 1958."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of operation are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of estimated costs among the various appropriations involved may be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Director, including the operation of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates to be determined by said Director to be sufficient to cover the cost of such operation, and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in the fiscal year in which they are advanced: *Provided further*, That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appropriations from which such funds are advanced."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "SEC. 210." named in said amendment insert "SEC. 211."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 23, 29, and 46.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. POTTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I regret that when the conference report on the Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill was before the Senate I was engaged in another meeting and was not present to discuss one item in the conference report.

When the appropriation bill was before the Senate, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee struck from the House bill a proviso which allowed the Solicitor's Office of the Labor Department to use funds from the highway trust fund, amounting to \$365,000, to carry out the Davis-Bacon provisions of the Highway Construction Act.

Mr. President, the Senate subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handled this bill on the part of the Senate received an opinion from the Senate legislative council stating that the use of funds from the highway trust fund for that purpose was not authorized by the basic act. Therefore, the Senate deleted that provision from the bill and requested the Department of Labor to come before the Congress with a supplemental request for funds to carry out the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act as applied to the Highway Construction Act. We found, however, in conference, that the House managers were adamant, and therefore the Senate had to yield its position.

There is no way in a conference report to raise a point of order, either in the House or in the Senate, against using funds from the Highway Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act. However, I think it well for every Member of the Senate to realize that this action of using funds from the Highway Trust Fund is not authorized by the basic act. It would be setting a precedent for having any Government agency that has anything to do with the interstate highway program dip its fingers into the trust fund. We would have a fund with no funds and little trust, if that should happen. It makes no more sense to have the Labor Department take \$365,000 out of the trust fund, because it is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, than it does for the Treasury Department to say, "We need funds from the Highway Trust Fund because we collect the taxes."

To me it is an important question for the Congress. I know it was the intention, when the basic act was adopted, to make sure the trust fund remained intact and would be used for only one purpose—building our Interstate Highway System.

As I stated before, we have had an opinion from the legislative counsel that the action which has been taken is not authorized by the basic law.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the Senator from Michigan for the statement he just made on the use of the trust fund for highway building purposes outside the construction of highways. In the State of Kansas we have a constitutional prohibition against using any funds collected for highway purposes by gasoline or other taxes for any work except highway construction,

and I think it ought to be the attitude of Congress, and it certainly is my personal attitude, that the use of the funds be only for highway construction.

I hope the time will never come when this Congress or any future Congress will permit a violation of the use of the trust fund and to divert it, when I believe it was the intention that it be used only for highway construction.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator will agree with me it was the intention of the committee and the Congress, when the basic highway legislation was enacted last year for the construction of the Interstate Highway System, that the funds would be used for the building of highways. If we allow agencies of government to dip their fingers into the trust fund, we destroy not only the fund but the trust we should have in it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state, additionally, that the Senate Finance Committee, under the direction of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the members of the committee handling questions relating to the fund, wrote into the bill a provision that highways should not be constructed at a more rapid speed than the funds warranted. That was done to protect the people of the United States from being obligated for indebtedness of any other type. If it should develop that highway funds were to be used by various agencies of the Federal Government for their purposes, we soon might find funds being used only for other agencies and not for highways.

Mr. POTTER. And not for highways; the Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I should like to conclude my remarks. It will take only a few minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well. I should like to make a comment relative to what the Senator is saying.

Mr. POTTER. We are in the position, Mr. President, that we have a conference report, and a point of order cannot be raised in the Senate or the House about this action taken in conference, because the House managers were adamant. Therefore, in amendment 4 of the conference report it is stated that \$200,000 will be taken from the highway trust fund to enforce the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I was one of those in the Senate who supported the Bacon-Davis provision to the act. I think it represents good legislation.

The committee specifically asked the Department of Labor to come forward with a supplemental request relative to the cost which would be involved in carrying out the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act relating to the interstate highway construction program.

But, in considering the conference report and what is happening now in relation to the \$200,000, which people are being taxed to obtain, so that it can be put into a trust fund to build highways, this sum of money is going to the De-

partment of Labor for administrative costs.

Another thing I fear is that the Department of Labor has other responsibilities in carrying out the Bacon-Davis provisions of other acts, and a trust fund always looks like a nice green apple for them to grab hold of as a means of securing funds, I am afraid, not only to carry out the Bacon-Davis provisions in the highway legislation but to carry out the Bacon-Davis provisions in other legislation which carries such an amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. POTTER. I am delighted to yield again to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I share the views of the Senator from Michigan in regard to securing from other regularly authorized funds the funds for the administration of the Bacon-Davis provisions of the act dealing with the Interstate Highway System. I will be glad to support that. However, I am violently opposed to any movement to take them from the interstate highway trust fund.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is correct. People fail to realize how this trust fund is obtained. It is obtained by taxing people, causing them to pay increases in gas and other taxes, to build up a fund for the purpose of building our Interstate Highway System. I am fearful that once this practice has been adopted, of dipping into the trust fund, we may find the Department of the Treasury will have just as much right to come forward and say, "We need a half million dollars of the trust fund because we collect the taxes." Some other agency may say, "We have something to do with the highway program, and we need a half million dollars." The next thing we will find is that we will end up with no funds.

I think it is unnecessary, but in order to make clear the position for the future, particularly with reference to appropriations for next year—that we will not be tampering with the trust fund—I am introducing proposed legislation which will make it amply clear that it is the intent of the Congress, which I am sure is contained in the basic act now on the books, that none of these funds shall be used for other agencies to carry out responsibilities which they may have in connection with the Interstate Highway System.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, a few years ago I was engaged in a lawsuit which involved the interpretation of a statute passed by the Legislature of California. I remember that opposing counsel in endeavoring to construe the legislation, addressed the court and said, most respectfully, that he did not know the intention with which the legislature passed the bill; that he did not believe opposing counsel knew the intention with which the legislature passed the bill; and that he did not believe the court knew the intention of the legislation.

I suppose that the legislative purposes of Congress in enacting legislation are not always entirely free from that type of indirect criticism.

I listened to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] object to the manner in which Congress this year—and the Senate acted only an hour ago—gave its stamp of approval to granting \$200,000 to be utilized by the Labor Department in enforcing the provisions of the so-called Davis-Bacon Act.

I recognize there is a great deal of merit in the position the senior Senator from Michigan takes, and perhaps Congress ought to give consideration to sequestering trust funds for one single purpose, such as the building of highways. So far, it has not been done. I want to make a certain opinion a part of the RECORD, so that Senators may see the interpretation given by the Comptroller General of the United States to that particular problem in the Federal highway legislation.

When some of us were interested in having the Senate recognize the need for the prevailing wage theory in connection with the multi-billion-dollar highway projects, the senior Senator from Michigan and his colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan, along with those who joined them on the floor of the Senate, were finally successful in having the prevailing wage legislation adopted.

I merely wish to make the point that the Comptroller General unequivocally determined that Congress had the right to do what the Senate finally did an hour ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the Comptroller General be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVAILABILITY OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND FOR USE IN DETERMINING PREVAILING WAGE RATES UNDER SECTION 115 OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

The following question has been raised in connection with the Department of Labor appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1958:

"Does section 209 (f) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act authorize the use of funds from the highway trust fund for administrative expenses of the Department under section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act?"¹

This question was answered in the affirmative by the 84th Congress—the same Congress that enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956.² It was also answered in the affirmative

¹ Sec. 209 (f) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act provides that amounts in the fund shall be available, as provided by appropriations acts, for making expenditures to meet those obligations incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act "which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations)."

² After the passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act and the Highway Revenue Act, in the same session of Congress, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, was enacted. This act appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, Department of Labor, "\$300,000, to be derived from the highway trust fund created by sec. 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956." The committee report on the bill stated that this amount was "for necessary salaries and expenses in carrying out the additional duties placed on the Secretary of

tive by the Comptroller General in an opinion issued on April 16, 1957 (decision B-131367).

In the light of contemporaneous approval by Congress and subsequent approval by the Comptroller General, the question would now appear settled both by precedent and by authoritative opinion. However, the purpose of this memorandum is to set forth information in addition to that referred to by the Comptroller General which will give further insight into the distinctive legislative history attendant upon the passage of these acts.³

1. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

A. General: While this memorandum does not purport to trace the full legislative history of the acts, it should be noted that there were no hearings or committee reports in the Senate regarding the inclusion of the Labor Department's functions in section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act. As a result, the Senate Appropriations Committee was the only forum in the Senate where those groups that opposed the Department of Labor's participation in the highway-construction program could voice their opposition.

During the congressional debate on the Federal-Aid Highway Act and the Highway Revenue Act in 1956, various proposals were offered to take from the Secretary of Labor the wage predetermination function and divert this activity to the States and to Federal agencies other than the Department of Labor. These efforts to curtail the responsibilities of the Labor Department and place the major part of the wage predetermination functions elsewhere were continued throughout the hearings on the supplemental appropriation bills.⁴

B. Appropriation Committee hearings: As Senator KUCHEL stated at the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill: ⁵

"Here is a situation, Mr. Chairman, where, in the closing weeks of the Congress, the highway legislation was adopted, and suddenly we find the need for some assistance to the Secretary of Labor in carrying out this highly important part of the new statute."⁶

The question of the availability of the trust fund for the purpose in question was expressly before the Appropriation Committee.⁷

Labor as a result of the application of the Davis-Bacon Act to highway projects on the Interstate System as provided in sec. 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956" (S. Rept. 2770).

³ A copy of the Comptroller General's Opinion is attached.

⁴ One proposal offered to the Senate Appropriations Committee would have required the Secretary of Labor to "accept and approve" the minimum wage recommendations of State highway departments "unless he finds evidence of fraud, willful misrepresentation, or lack of good faith on the part of a State in carrying out the intent of said act" (hearings, pp. 282-283).

The committee summarily rejected this proposal and inserted a statement in its report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, making it clear that the function of predetermining wage rates under sec. 115 was to be performed exclusively by the Secretary of Labor and no part of his function was to be delegated to other agencies (S. Rept. 2770, p. 11).

⁵ During the hearings on the first supplemental appropriation bill, the committee considered, but made no appropriation to the Labor Department for Davis-Bacon functions, under the Highway Act.

⁶ Hearings on second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, p. 275.

⁷ In his letter of July 16, 1956, to the chairman of the committee, Secretary Mitchell pointed out that the Department's supplemental request "contemplates funds to be made available from the highway trust fund

Senator KUCHEL, after his statement quoted above, went on to say:

"I noticed that apparently this committee could act in either of two ways. It could either make a general fund appropriation available to the Secretary, or it could provide for utilization by the Secretary of Labor of moneys in the highway-trust fund."

During these same hearings, Senator HOLLAND, a member of the Appropriations Committee, agreed that the funds for the Secretary of Labor could come from the highway trust fund. He stated:

"I regret that it comes out of the highway-trust fund, but that is what the law provides. That means it cuts down the mileage that is available out of the road-trust fund. * * * Since the act so provides, that is where it will have to come, I suppose."

The hearing before the full Appropriations Committee of the Senate where these statements were made was a hearing at which the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce was requesting necessary appropriations from the highway-trust fund (hearings, second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, pp. 263 et seq.). The estimates submitted included \$13,300,000 for administrative expenses of that Bureau (hearings, p. 266). It was in the course of this hearing on expenditures from the highway trust fund that Senator KUCHEL and Senator GORE appeared on behalf of an appropriation to the Department of Labor for the wage determination functions under the Highway Act, and Chairman HAYDEN and Senator CHAVEZ requested the testimony of Department of Labor representatives who were present. In this context, it appears significant that none of the Senators who were present (some of whom were also members of the Committee on Public Works which had considered the Highway Act) raised any question as to the availability of moneys in the trust fund for the appropriation to the Department of Labor for Highway Act functions. The only statements referring to the use of trust-fund moneys were those quoted above, in which the Senators indicated their understanding that the law made the fund available for this purpose.

The suggestion, therefore, that there is no legislative history dealing with the question of whether appropriations could be made to the Department of Labor from the Highway Trust Fund conveniently ignores the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee. The committee, which was the proper forum in which the question could be raised, carefully considered it and then approved an appropriation to the Department of Labor from the Trust Fund. Subsequently, the committee's action was approved by the entire Congress.

2. OPERATING COST OF THE WAGE PREDETERMINATION PROGRAM AS A LEGITIMATE CHARGE TO THE TRUST FUND

It was contemplated that the operating cost of the wage predetermination program would be paid from revenues derived from the Highway Revenue Act. This was so obvious from the language of the act and from the legislative history that there was no need to spell it out in so many words. At page 37 of the Senate report⁸ and page 70 of the House report⁹ on the Highway Revenue bill it is stated that expenditures

created by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956." The letter further stated that "if the Congress should consider it more appropriate we would have no objection to an appropriation from general revenues." (Senate hearings on second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, p. 284.)

⁸ Report of the Senate Committee on Finance (S. Rept. 2054).

⁹ Report of the House Committee on Public Works (H. Rept. 2022).

"as appropriated by Congress" may be made from the Trust Fund "to meet those obligations of the United States" incurred under the Federal-Aid Highway Act "which are attributable to Federal-aid highways." The reports further noted that "the expenditures referred to are those which normally have been paid out of the appropriation entitled 'Federal Aid Highways, Bureau of Public Road, Department of Commerce'."

The operating cost of the wage predetermination functions under the Davis-Bacon Act had not previously been considered a normal expenditure of federally-assisted highway construction programs because the Davis-Bacon Act did not apply to these earlier programs. However, it is important to observe that, by its own terms, the Highway Act requires a consultative relationship between the Secretary of Labor and the State highway departments in the determination of the prevailing wage rates and insertion of the rates in the State's bid and contract documents. These requirements, together with the requirement that the wage rates determined shall be those prevailing in the immediate locality of the highway project, are specified in the Highway Act, as distinguished from Davis-Bacon Act.

These functions prescribed in the Highway Act are interwoven with the other functions involved in the preparation of bid and contract documents and specifications for each project on the Interstate System. They are an integral part of, and directly related to, the awarding of particular highway contracts under the act's provisions. It is clear, therefore, that the cost of predetermining wage rates under section 115 of the act is an expenditure attributable to Federal-aid highways within the meaning of the express language in section 209 (f) (1) of the act and in the committee reports. As Senator GORE stated during the Senate Appropriations Committee hearings: "I do not see how the Department of Commerce could approve an interstate highway project under the law" unless the wage determination provisions in section 115 become operative.

It should also be noted that under the Federal-Aid Highway Act prior to the 1956 act, regulations of the Bureau of Public Roads provided for certain minimum wages to be determined by the States on Federal-aid projects. The preparation and enforcement of these regulations were part of the administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads, and presumably the expenses of the States in determining the wages and placing them in the contracts were chargeable to the costs of the projects for purposes of reimbursement under the act. If the proponents of State, as opposed to Federal, determination of prevailing wages under the 1956 act had prevailed, the cost of this work attributable to each project would, it is assumed, have been payable out of the highway trust fund in the same proportion as other costs of the projects. Similarly, if the former functions of the Bureau of Public Roads with respect to prescribing minimum wages had been expanded along the lines of the functions presently assigned by section 115 of the act to the Secretary of Labor, the expense of performing the same functions would have been part of the administrative expenses of the Bureau and, therefore, clearly payable out of the highway trust fund. The nature of the functions and the closeness of their relationship to the actual awarding of contracts by the States for projects on the Interstate System is not different because the Highway Act prescribes that they shall be performed by the Secretary of Labor. The fact that this function under the Highway Act is performed by the Secretary of Labor, rather than by the States or the Bureau of Public Roads in no way alters or lessens

the propriety of charging the cost of its operation to the highway trust fund as an expenditure attributable to Federal-aid highways.

There is no rule of statutory construction which supports the interpretation of the word "including" (in section 209 (f) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act)¹⁰ as meaning exclusive or all-embracing. On the contrary, as the Comptroller General pointed out in his opinion of April 16, 1957, "The parenthetical statement 'including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations' merely emphasizes the congressional intent that the funds shall be used to defray the administrative expenses incurred by the Bureau of Public Roads in carrying out the Federal-aid highway program." There is nothing in the act which can be construed "as precluding the Congress from utilizing the fund for other or more extended purposes if it chooses to do so."¹¹

3. CONCLUSION

A conclusion that Congress did not intend to, or cannot now, use the trust fund for the purpose in question might be justified if the legislative history had been contrary to the history discussed in this memorandum, and if Congress had, in 1956, denied the use of the trust fund for this purpose. However, the actual situation is exactly the opposite and it can only be concluded, therefore, that Congress, in enacting the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, intended that the trust fund could be used in 1956 and in subsequent years for the purpose of making wage predeterminations under section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

Belated efforts to prove that what Congress did in 1956 was improper, after the same Congress that enacted the highway legislation considered the matter and determined otherwise,¹² impute to Congress, at the least, a striking inconsistency, if not a willful and incredible disregard of the very provisions it had placed in the law to govern its action. Of equally serious import, these efforts to impugn the propriety of the prior congressional action raise questions with respect to the validity of existing programs and existing expenditures under the Highway Act.

There has been no contention by a Member of Congress or, to our knowledge, by any person outside of Congress that these existing programs and expenditures are invalid.

¹⁰ As previously noted, section 209 (f) (1) authorizes expenditures from the trust fund, as provided by appropriations acts, "which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations)."

¹¹ To the same effect, see *Federal Land Bank of St. Paul v. Bismarck Lumber Co.* (314 U. S. 95, 100), where the Supreme Court noted that "We recently had occasion, under other circumstances, to point out that the term 'including' is not one of all-embracing definition, but connotes simply an illustrative application of the general principle. *Phelps Dodge Corp. v. Labor Board* (313 U. S. 177, 189); see also *Helvering v. Morgan's, Inc.* (293 U. S. 121, 125)."

¹² In construing a statute, the courts have recognized, on numerous occasions, that great weight should be accorded to the interpretation given to the statute by the enacting Congress. "The words of a statute must be taken in the sense in which they were understood at the time when the statute was enacted and the statute must be construed as it was intended to be understood when it was passed." (50 Am. Jur., Statutes, sec. 236, citing *United States v. Stewart* (311 U. S. 60); *Platt v. Union P. R. Co.* (99 U. S. 48)).

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 15, 1957.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF LABOR.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: By letter dated April 3, 1957, with enclosures, the Acting Secretary of Labor requested our advice whether section 209 (f) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 399) authorizes the use of funds from the highway trust fund for administrative expenses of the Department of Labor in making wage determinations provided for in section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 385).

In section 115 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the Congress extended the requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act of August 30, 1935, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a) to highway projects of the National System of Interstate Highways. The Congress further provided therein that the Secretary of Labor shall make predeterminations of prevailing wage rates, which "shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project."

Section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 established a highway trust fund on the books of the Government, and in subsection (f) (1) thereof defined the scope of its expenditure availability as follows:

"(1) Federal-aid highway program: Amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways (including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations)."

In his letter the Acting Secretary of Labor expresses the view to the effect that expenses in connection with making the wage determinations constitute obligations that are "attributable to Federal-aid highways" and, therefore, properly payable from the highway trust fund. The same conclusion was stated in an accompanying memorandum of law of the Solicitor of your Department.

The quoted section 209 (f) (1)—by its plain terms—makes amounts established in the highway trust fund available, as provided by appropriation acts, for expenditure after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to cover those obligations which are attributable to Federal-aid highways. The parenthetical statement "including those portions of general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads payable from such appropriations" merely emphasizes the congressional intent that the fund is to be used to defray the administrative expenses incurred by the Bureau of Public Roads in carrying out the Federal-aid highway program.

In reporting out H. R. 10660 which became the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, it was stated in House Report No. 2022 (p. 70), and in Senate Report No. 2054 (p. 37) with reference to said section 209 (f) (1) that "The expenditures referred to are those which normally have been paid out of the appropriation entitled 'Federal-Aid Highways, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.'" While this explanation of the character of expenditures properly chargeable to the fund may have been intended to operate as a restriction on its authorized uses, such explanation may not be construed as precluding the Congress from utilizing the fund for other or more extended purposes if it chooses to do so. And it must be recognized that the latest expression of the Congress is controlling. (See 19 Comp. Gen. 961.)

If your inquiry is directed to the question of whether a proposed appropriation from the highway trust fund to the Department of Labor to carry out its Davis-Bacon Act functions is so authorized by the enabling legislation as not to be subject to a point of order under the rules of the respective Houses of the Congress, this, of course, is a matter not within our province to decide, but rather for determination by those Houses in conducting their proceedings.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ASSUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY BY SUPREME COURT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina: Mr. President, I note with extreme interest the wave of criticism of the Supreme Court by Senators and Representatives from the North, the Midwest, and the Far West, who have complained in recent days of the high tribunal's assumption of legislative authority.

I congratulate them on their alertness to this danger and I wish to assure these Senators and Representatives that the South welcomes them in their newly found position in this matter. But for the record, I should like to point out that the South has been conscious of this assumption of legislative powers by the Supreme Court ever since May 1954, when the High Court's attacks broke through the bounds of the Constitution and made a major invasion into the powers of Congress.

Mr. President, I am most thankful that these Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have joined the South in an awakening to this invasion by the Supreme Court, and urge that we stick together in this common fight to protect representative government.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am sure that Members of the Senate are aware the Commission on Government Security, which was created by act of Congress, has concluded its year and a half of deliberation, and made a report which has been the subject of some interest and some comment in the last few days.

The members of the Commission from the Senate of the United States are the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the junior Senator from New Hampshire.

At this time I desire to introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills, which embody the legislative recommendations of the Commission on Government Security.

Mr. President, the first bill I introduce is entitled, "To establish a central security office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel loyalty and security programs, to prescribe administrative procedures for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs, and for other purposes."

I desire, Mr. President, to introduce that bill for appropriate reference for myself and on behalf of my colleague on the Commission, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2414) to establish a central security office to coordinate the administration of Federal personnel loyalty and security programs, to prescribe administrative procedures for the hearing and review of cases arising under such programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. STENNIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the second bill I desire to introduce is a bill to prescribe a standard of loyalty to the United States Government for military personnel, to prescribe procedures for the determination of the loyalty of such personnel, and for other purposes.

I desire to introduce this bill for appropriate reference, for myself and for the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2415) to prescribe a standard of loyalty to the United States Government for military personnel, to prescribe procedures for the determination of the loyalty of such personnel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, for himself and Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the third bill I desire to introduce is a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide more effectively for immigration and passport security, and for other purposes. I desire to introduce this bill for appropriate reference, for myself and for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2416) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide more effectively for immigration and passport security, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, for himself and Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the fourth bill I desire to introduce is a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit unauthorized disclosure of certain information critically affecting national defense. I desire to introduce this bill, for appropriate reference, for myself and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2417) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit unauthorized disclosure of certain information critically affecting national defense, introduced by Mr. COTTON, for himself

Public Law 85-67
85th Congress, H. R. 6287
June 29, 1957

AN ACT

71 Stat. 210.

Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, namely:

Departments of
Labor, and Health,
Education, and
Welfare Appropria-
tion Act, 1958.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; and purchase of uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); \$1,480,000, of which not more than \$180,000 shall be for international labor affairs: *Provided*, That the limitation of \$154,490 for international labor affairs appearing in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 423) is increased to \$159,490. 60 Stat. 810.

Working capital fund: There is hereby established a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) a central visual exhibit service; (3) a central supply service for supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet, in whole or in part, the requirements of the Department; and (4) telephone, mail and messenger services: *Provided*, That any stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order on June 30, 1957, shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That the fund may be used to finance the cost of centralized procurement of supplies and equipment and that the fund shall be reimbursed in advance from available funds of bureaus, offices, and agencies for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operations, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$2,121,000, together with not to exceed \$200,000 to be derived from the highway trust fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not less than \$182,575 for the 63 Stat. 865.
61 Stat. 136.

work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409): *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for the President's Committee shall be subject to reduction or transfer to any other department or agency under the provisions of any existing law; including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards; \$985,000.

BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 351), the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 401), and section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U. S. C. App. 459), and the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 598), \$542,000.

54 Stat. 890;
70A Stat. 641;
54 Stat. 828;
62 Stat. 614;
65 Stat. 86.
50 USC 925
note.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the Acts of March 4, 1913 (5 U. S. C. 611), and August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$3,600,000.

37 Stat. 736.
50 Stat. 664.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,958,000, of which \$5,832,400 shall be derived by transfer from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment Trust Fund, and, of which \$1,125,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

60 Stat. 810.

58 Stat. 293.
38 USC 695-
695f.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment, and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, for necessary expenses including purchasing and installing of air-conditioning equipment in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia, and for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684) and title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1130), \$259,814,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic

48 Stat. 113.

38 USC 695b.
49 Stat. 626.

38 USC 991-999.
42 USC 1361-
1370.

grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

42 USC 502.

In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on the merit basis, shall apply.

42 USC 503.

None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

49 Stat. 626.
42 USC 501-503.
48 Stat. 113.
29 USC 49-49n.

Unemployment compensation for veterans: For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, \$36,800,000.

66 Stat. 684.
38 USC 991-999.

Unemployment compensation for veterans, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, such sums as may be necessary to pay benefits for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

Unemployment compensation for Federal employees: For payments to unemployed Federal employees, either directly or through payments to States, as authorized by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$25,000,000.

68 Stat. 1130.
42 USC 1361-
1370.

Unemployment compensation for Federal employees, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States, as authorized by title XV of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as may be required for payment to unemployed Federal employees for the first quarter of the next suc-

ceeding fiscal year, and the obligations and expenditures thereunder shall be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

7 USC 1461-
1468.

Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under the Act of July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119), as amended, including temporary employment of persons without regard to the civil service laws, \$2,250,000.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

44 Stat. 1444;
70 Stat. 656.
33 USC 944.

Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative expenses and not to exceed \$113,400 for the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, \$2,838,000, together with not to exceed \$47,400 to be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906).

60 Stat. 696.

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation and other benefits and expenses (except administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses, including transportation and other expenses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in such cases and for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C., app. 2012); such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year.

39 Stat. 742.

50 USC app.
2003-2004.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

60 Stat. 810.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$7,200,000.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

41 Stat. 987.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$462,000.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

52 Stat. 1060.
29 USC 201.

49 Stat. 2036.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35-45), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and not to exceed \$3,000 for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$10,600,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made. 60 Stat. 810.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1958". Citation of title.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101-105), \$328,000. 41 Stat. 272.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); including purchase of not to exceed eighty-nine passenger motor vehicles of which fifty-one shall be for replacement only; reporting and illustrating the results of investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; payment in advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$9,300,000. 52 Stat. 1040; 29 Stat. 604; 44 Stat. 1101, 1406; 42 Stat. 1486.

Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and other services: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspection of certain products, and for the establishment of tolerances for pesticides, in accordance with sections 406, 408, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 346a, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payments of fees for services in connection with such certifications, inspections, or establishment of tolerances, to remain available until expended. The total amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expenses of advisory committees; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered. 52 Stat. 1049; 55 Stat. 851; 59 Stat. 463.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on Salary restriction.

71 Stat. 215.

Payments by
District of
Columbia.

a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

68 Stat. 265.
D.C. Code 31-
1025 to 31-
1032.
31 Stat. 844.

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Gallaudet College, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements, as authorized by the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law 420), \$730,000: *Provided*, That Gallaudet College shall be paid by the District of Columbia, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, at the rate of \$1,295 per school year for each student attending and receiving instruction in elementary or secondary education pursuant to the Act of March 1, 1901 (31 D. C. Code 1008).

Construction: For the construction and equipment of buildings and facilities on the grounds of Gallaudet College, as authorized by the Act of June 18, 1954 (Public Law 420), under the supervision of the General Services Administration, including planning, architectural, and engineering services, \$1,690,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959, as follows: For a cafeteria and service building and a men's dormitory, together with alterations, installations, and equipment in connection with such construction, and for beginning roads, walks, and grading in connection with such construction.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$3,800,000.

Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University, of a physical education building and a home economics building, \$150,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959.

Construction of buildings: For equipping the dental school building under the supervision of General Services Administration, \$262,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959, and such amount shall be in addition to the limitation of cost established by Public Law 452, Eighty-second Congress.

66 Stat. 363.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 2; 70 Stat. 1126), and section 202 of said Act (70 Stat. 925), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 909), including \$4,000,000 for extension and improvement of practical nurse training, and \$228,000 for voca-

42 USC 242d note.
43 Stat. 18;
47 Stat. 1489;
64 Stat. 27.
20 USC 34.

tional education in the fishery trades and industry including distributive occupations therein, \$33,750,081: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under section 3 (a), (1), (2), (3), and (4) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$29,267,081 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount of allotment which States and Territories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned. 20 USC 15j.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,501,500. 49 Stat. 439.

Grants for library services: For grants to the States pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1956, as amended (70 Stat. 293-296, 911), \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount of any State's allotment from this appropriation which such State certifies will remain unpaid to it on June 30, 1959, may be reallocated by the Commissioner among other States applying therefor in proportion to their rural population, and deemed part of such allotments, except that no State's allotment shall be so increased as to exceed the allotment which would be made to it were this appropriation equal to the maximum authorized under such Act. 20 USC 352-358.

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U. S. C. ch. 13; 70 Stat. 909, 970-972), \$127,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

Assistance for school construction: For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title III and title IV of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U. S. C., ch. 14; 70 Stat. 909, 968-969), including not to exceed \$700,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies and not to exceed \$5,000,000 for title IV, \$41,700,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering nationwide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; and cooperative research, surveys, and demonstrations in education as authorized by the Act of July 26, 1954 (20 U. S. C. 331-332); \$7,000,000, of which not less than \$550,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized. 68 Stat. 533.

President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School: For salaries and expenses for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings, \$50,000. 60 Stat. 810.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

68 Stat. 652.
29 USC 31-42. Grants to States and other agencies: For grants to States and other agencies in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$45,100,000, of which \$40,000,000 is for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of said Act; \$1,500,000 is for extension and improvement projects under section 3 of said Act; and \$3,600,000 is for special projects under section 4 of said Act: *Provided*, That allotments under section 2 of said Act to the States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of \$53,000,000, and this amount shall be considered the sum available for allotments under such section for such fiscal year.

29 USC 32, 33. Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, grants to States under sections 2 and 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

29 USC 34, 37. Training and traineeships: For training and traineeships pursuant to section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and for carrying out the training functions provided for in section 7 of said Act, \$4,400,000.

29 USC 31-42.
49 Stat. 1559. Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), as amended, \$1,330,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

58 Stat. 682.
64 Stat. 1100. For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including expenses for active commissioned officers in the Reserve Corps and for not to exceed one thousand six hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps; and except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 236-244), for expenses of primary and secondary schooling of dependents of Public Health Service personnel stationed in foreign countries, in amounts not to exceed an average of \$250 per student, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and for the transportation of such dependents between such schools and their places of residence when the schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation; and for the payment of compensation to consultants or individual scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to section 207 (e) or section 207 (f) of the Act at rates established by the Surgeon General not to exceed \$15,000 per annum; as follows:

58 Stat. 685.
70 Stat. 910.
42 USC 246,
243, 241. Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes not otherwise specifically provided for, of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; to provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics; to provide traineeships pursuant to section 306 of the Act; and not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General; \$22,592,000.

70 Stat. 923.
42 USC 242d.

Grants and special studies, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 371 of the Act, including the hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, and the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings, \$2,165,000. 42 USC 241, 243, 246, 264, 266, 273.

Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers for the diagnosis and treatment of persons afflicted with venereal diseases; and for grants of money, services, supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine; \$4,415,000. 42 USC 246, 266.

Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (b) of the Act, \$7,000,000, of which not less than \$4,500,000 shall be available only for grants to States, to be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds expended for the same purpose, for direct expenses of prevention and case-finding projects including salaries, fees, and travel of personnel directly engaged in prevention and case-finding and the necessary equipment and supplies used directly in prevention and case-finding operations, but excluding the purchase of care in hospitals and sanatoria. 42 USC 246(b).

Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as otherwise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$6,250,000. 42 USC 241, 243, 264,

Sanitary engineering activities: For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, 314 (c), and 361 of the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the purposes of the Acts of July 14, 1955 (Public Law 159), and July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), including \$2,700,000 for grants to States and \$300,000 for grants to interstate agencies; and the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$12,640,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958. 42 USC 241, 243, 246(c), 264. 69 Stat. 322. 42 USC 1857-1857f. 70 Stat. 498. 33 USC 466 note.

Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (70 Stat. 502), \$45,000,000 which together with the amount appropriated under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 769) shall be applied to payment on account of allotments made for the current and preceding fiscal years pursuant to said Act, such sums to remain available only until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That allotments under such section 6 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of \$50,000,000. 33 USC 466e.

Grants for hospital construction: For payments under parts C and G, title VI, of the Act, as amended, \$121,200,000, of which \$99,000,000 shall be for payments for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,200,000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636 60 Stat. 1042; 68 Stat. 462. 42 USC 291d-291h; 291s-291v.

of the Act, and \$21,000,000 shall be for payments for facilities pursuant to part G, as follows: \$6,500,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$4,000,000 for rehabilitation facilities, and \$4,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided*, That allotments under such parts C and G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI of the Act, as amended, \$1,450,000.

Surveys and planning for hospital construction: The funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 810) shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1958.

Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the functions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), including \$1,186,000 to be available only for payments for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250-254), and under sections 307, 321, 322, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 810 of the Public Health Service Act, Private Law 419 of the Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and Executive Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services; and purchase of firearms and ammunition; \$44,399,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be exclusively available for payments to the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health service program for any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the purposes of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available, including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries. \$3,876,000.

Indian health activities: For expenses necessary to enable Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 1954 (42 U. S. C. 2001), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) (including not to exceed \$10,000 for such services at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals, when authorized by the Surgeon General); purchase of not to exceed fifty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; \$40,100,000.

Construction of Indian health facilities: For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; and purchase of trailers; \$3,096,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That such expendi-

60 Stat. 903.

37 USC 401 note.

70 Stat. 924,

721.

42 USC 242d, 248,

249, 251, 253, 255-

257, 259, 260, 220,

222, 249 and

note; 33 USC

763c and note.

68 Stat. A74.

3 CFR 1943 Cum.

Supp., p.1101.

42 USC 264-272.

42 USC 252, 249.

68 Stat. 674.

60 Stat. 810.

42 USC 248, 227.

tures may be made through the Department of the Interior at the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

National Institutes of Health, general research and services: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects and training grants pursuant to section 301 of the Act; regulation and preparation of biologic products, and conduct of research related thereto; purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$14,026,000.

42 USC 241.

National Institutes of Health Management Fund: For the purpose of facilitating the economical and efficient conduct of operations in the National Institutes of Health which are financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of operation are not readily susceptible of distribution as charges to such appropriations, there is hereby established the National Institutes of Health Management Fund. Such amounts as the Director of the National Institutes of Health may determine to represent a reasonable distribution of estimated costs among the various appropriations involved may be advanced each year to this fund and shall be available for expenditure for such costs under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Director, including the operation of facilities for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates to be determined by said Director to be sufficient to cover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced to this fund shall be available only in the fiscal year in which they are advanced: *Provided further*, That final adjustments of advances in accordance with actual costs shall be effected wherever practicable with the appropriations from which such funds are advanced.

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; and to contract on a cost or other basis for supplies and services by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy program, including indemnification of contractors to the extent and subject to the limitations provided in title 10, United States Code, section 2354, except that approval and certification required thereby shall be by the Surgeon General; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the Act; \$56,402,000.

41 USC 5.

70A Stat. 134.

42 USC 281-286.

Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 304, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases, \$39,217,000.

70 Stat. 929.

42 USC 241-244,
246c.

National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, \$35,936,000.

62 Stat. 464,

42 USC 287 note.

Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases and conditions, \$6,430,000.

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, \$20,385,000.

71 Stat. 221.

Allergy and infectious disease activities: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to allergy and infectious diseases, \$17,400,000, of which \$150,000 shall be available for payment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act relating to neurology and blindness, \$21,387,000.

70 Stat. 717.
42 USC 292 note. Grants for construction of health research facilities: For grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, \$30,000,000.

National Library of Medicine: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the National Library of Medicine Act (70 Stat. 960), \$1,450,000.
42 USC 275 note.

Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year.
67 Stat. 501.
37 USC 371
note.

Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and publications related to public health; and conducting studies and demonstrations in public health methods; \$5,100,000.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including clothing for patients, and cooperation with organizations or individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$3,085,800.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$55,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Construction, treatment and cafeteria building: For expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifications for a treatment and cafeteria building at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, \$180,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to General Services Administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, not more than \$130,000,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That such amounts as are required shall be available to pay the cost of necessary travel incident to medical examinations for verifying disabilities of individuals who file applications for disability determinations under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended.
49 Stat. 622.
42 USC 401-425.

Advances to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, advances to States under section 221 (e) of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary from the above authorization may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.
70 Stat. 823.
42 USC 421e.

Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For an additional amount for "Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance" for construction of an office building and appurtenant facilities, including acquisition of land, \$5,710,000, to be derived from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund which, together with sums heretofore appropriated for these purposes, shall establish a limitation of cost of \$31,080,000: *Provided*, That the established limit of cost may be exceeded or shall be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage increase or decrease, if any, in construction costs generally dating from October 1, 1956, as determined by the Administrator, General Services Administration, and the amount to be derived from the aforesaid trust fund shall be increased or decreased accordingly: *Provided further*, That the immediately preceding proviso shall be effective only if a contract for construction is executed on or before December 1, 1957.

Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, V, and XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV, X, and XIV), \$1,600,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year. 70 Stat. 807.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, \$1,900,000.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6), and title V of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That any State plan which provides standards for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State shall be approved. 37 Stat. 79.
49 Stat. 629.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For grants to States for maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$41,500,000, of which \$15,000,000 shall be available for services for crippled children, \$16,500,000 for maternal and child-health services, and \$10,000,000 for child-welfare services: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State: *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502 (b) of such Act shall be used only for special projects for mentally retarded children. 49 Stat. 629-633.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner of Social Security, \$300,000, together with not to exceed \$240,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. 42 USC 702, 712, 704, 714.

70 Stat. 807;
851.
42 USC 906.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, and section 705 of title VII, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan was submitted for approval.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,800,000, together with not to exceed \$260,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration: For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Administration, \$2,300,000, together with not to exceed \$700,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: For expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel, \$500,000, together with not to exceed \$25,000 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not to exceed \$449,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

63 Stat. 386;
70 Stat. 493,
1020.
40 USC 484.

Surplus property utilization: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j), (k), (n), and (o), of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, \$502,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Library mem-
berships.

SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

Experts, etc.

SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

60 Stat. 810.
Travel ex-
penses.

SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the functions or activities for which such appropriations are made.

Uniforms.

SEC. 205. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131).

State agencies
for grants in
aid.

SEC. 206. None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Social Security Administration for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including

the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

SEC. 207. The Secretary is authorized to make such transfers of motor vehicles, between bureaus and offices, without transfer of funds, as may be required in carrying out the operations of the Department.

SEC. 208. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of the direct costs.

SEC. 209. None of the obligational authority available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for planning and/or construction of buildings shall remain available after June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That existing obligational authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of the general office and the dental research buildings of the National Institutes of Health, and the National Library of Medicine building of the Public Health Service, shall remain available until June 30, 1958.

SEC. 210. None of the funds provided herein shall be used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone in connection with the construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

SEC. 211. To the extent and under the conditions provided by regulations of the Secretary, officers (including commissioned officers of the Public Health Service) and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may hereafter, in connection with their attendance at meetings or in performing advisory services concerned with the functions or activities of the Department, be permitted to accept payment, in cash or in kind, from non-Federal agencies, organizations, and individuals, for travel and subsistence expenses, to be retained by them to cover the cost thereof or deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost thereof is paid, as may be provided in such regulations.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958".

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); \$9,384,800: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hear-

Motor
vehicles.

Construction
of buildings.

Lease-purchase
program.

Attendance at
meetings, etc.

Citation of
title.

61 Stat. 136.

60 Stat. 810.

68 Stat. 1114.

49 Stat. 450.
61 Stat. 136.
52 Stat. 1060.

ings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U. S. C. 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (29 U. S. C. 203), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, non-profit basis and at least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

60 Stat. 810.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$520,000.

44 Stat. 582,
586.

Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses necessary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$250,000.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

60 Stat. 810.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$525,000, of which not less than \$155,000 shall be available for compensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

44 Stat. 578.

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

60 Stat. 810.

5 USC 2131.

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund): For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board, when specifically authorized by the Board; stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1935 (68 Stat. 1114); \$8,150,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

61 Stat. 136,
154, 155.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; Government listed telephones in private residences and private apartments for official use in cities where mediators are officially stationed, but no Federal mediation and conciliation service

office is maintained; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only at not to exceed \$3,000; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 60 Stat. 810. 55a); \$3,550,000.

TITLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses of the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of its business in the conservancy district established pursuant to the Act of July 11, 1940 (54 33 USC 567b. Stat. 748), \$5,000.

TITLE VIII—UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

For maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund, \$4,750,000, of which \$34,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1959 for construction of buildings and facilities, including demolition: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, upon the recommendation of the Board of Commissioners of the Home and the Surgeon General of the Army.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall ~~Publicity or~~ be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the ~~propaganda.~~ Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor, and Health, Short title. Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1958."

Approved June 29, 1957.

